THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH

VOLUME XX NOVEMBER, 1934 NUMBER 4

THE CONVICTION-PERSUASION DUALITY

EDWARD Z. ROWELL
University of California

THE PROBLEM

TWO years ago there appeared in this journal my monographic study "Prolegomena to Argumentation." The four instalments of this treatise dealt with some of the important problems of that sphere of rhetorical theory which underlies our discipline of argumentation. The problems selected were those which had been under discussion for a decade and a half and which had arisen out of the published belief of some teachers of speech that our theory of argumentation ought to be fundamentally revised. My attitude in the matter was that the issues thus raised were so important that they constituted a crucial challenge to the scholarship in our profession. I felt, as I feel now, that the questions before us should be dealt with assiduously and persistently until all the facts relating to them are brought to light and until all unsolved problems receive at least sound technical formulation.

My "Prolegomena" has thus far evoked no response in print. It has, however, brought out a very large number of "reactions" in letter and conversation. And in these "reactions" there appears with impressive frequency a request for a more detailed treatment of the conviction-persuasion duality. It is to this request that I am addressing myself in the present article.

Stated very generally and skeletally, the type of reasoning about the conviction-persuasion duality which I set out to examine in the "Prolegomena" may be said to run as follows:

1. Since a speaker is in the business of doing something to the behavior of his hearers, this activity must logically constitute a field for psychological investigation. And this implies that the fundamental approach to rhetorical theory ought to be sought in the science of psychology.

2. On examination, modern psychology is found to be basically monistic in its view of human behavior. That is to say, modern psychology thinks of man not as possessing a number of independent or semi-independent faculties but as a unified reaction-system. It treats all behavior as a stimulus-response affair. It likes to place all responses under some general category such as *reaction*.

3. If this is so, then the suspicion is aroused that our traditional division of the "means of persuasion" into the variously defined and interpreted "appeals to reason" and "appeals to feelings" or "conviction" and "persuasion" may be without legitimate foundation. And this suspicion, upon analysis, appears to receive convincing confirmation.

4. It must follow, therefore (and here I use the words of Woolbert), "that any division of appeal and speech into *conviction* and *persuasion* is unsound from the point of view of psychology and unnecessary from the point of view of rhetorical theory."

To this line of reasoning my "Prolegomena" replied in effect as follows:

1. It is true that psychological considerations are of essential importance to rhetoric. This fact was fully recognized and systematically taken into account even in the rhetorical studies of the logic-creating Aristotle. But to say that psychology is the fundamental science in rhetoric is quite another matter. Any unbiased empirical analysis of real argumentative situations must convince one that it is not possible to say that any one science is fundamental to rhetoric.

2. Even when we adopt quite whole-heartedly the so-called psychological monism found in most of the psychological writings of our time, we do not rid ourselves of important dualisms and pluralisms; for at some points in human behavior such distinctions as, for example, reasoning and feeling, become not only legitimate but scientifically inescapable.

3. When we are thus freed from the necessity of going to psychology exclusively for our fundamentals and of relying on the unrelieved monism just mentioned, and when with an eye to empirical fact we survey the data relevant to our problem, we are brought to the conclusion that in Aristotle's division of the "means

of persuasion" we have the only sound clue to the nature of the conviction-persuasion duality. Aristotle's duality is based neither on psychology exclusively nor on any other science exclusively. As a set of categories it cuts across at least two sciences, the sciences of psychology and logic.

4. The conviction-persuasion duality is of fundamental importance in all knowledge-establishing thinking. The scientist, for example, must distinguish rather carefully between factors that are relevant and sound in the evidential validation of ideas and those factors that may induce belief in other ways than through evidential validation. But so far as interest in the evidential worth of our statements enters into discourse, the conviction-persuasion duality must at times actually and always potentially be as important in rhetoric as it is in logic.

Now, the central problem before us in relation to this famous duality can be stated as follows: When a speaker is addressing an audience the audience does *react* to the activity of that speaker as to a mass of stimuli, and this stimulation and this reacting appear to be classifiable as psychological phenomena. It does seem, therefore, that psychology ought to have something important to say about what dualities, if any, can be discovered in the processes involved in the speaker-audient situation. But, how can we believe that a duality can have a place there if we also believe in the unity of all response? In the "Prolegomena" we find a frank acceptance of both the duality and this doctrine of psychological monism. Aren't we faced here with an intolerable contradiction? Or will a more detailed interpretation of both the duality and the monism show that the supposed contradiction is not real? Our problem, clearly, calls for a much more detailed analysis of these matters than was found in my monograph.

The Aristotelian Duality in Reinterpretation

As far as documentary evidence can testify, the first technical recognition of the conviction-persuasion duality as a major principle in rhetoric seems to have appeared in the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle. Whatever the full early history of the concept may have been, however, one thing must be regarded as certain, and that is that the impulse to recognize some sort of a duality in relation to rhetorical processes is well-nigh universal. It is found even among people who are given to very little critical reflection about their speaking or writing. It appears as a semi-naïve distinction forced upon human

minds by the recognition of significant differences in the character of their experiences. It obviously represents in all cases definitely felt distinctions between different sets of values.

At times people apprehend this duality as a distinction between "heart" and "mind." In such cases the people are likely to emphasize the "appeal to the heart." This is certainly true in the fields of theology, as is shown in the simple but essentially philosophical declaration of Pascal that "the heart has reasons of its own that the reason knows not of."

At times people apprehend it as of a piece with their disapproval of extreme emotionalism. They cannot draw the line of demarcation sharply or even definitely, but they feel that there is a bound of legitimacy in emotional appeal which thoughtful people must recognize.

At times people apprehend it as a distinction between the ethical and the unethical in rhetorical appeal. They feel the wrong in sophistry, in misrepresentation, in browbeating, in flattery, and other practices of a similar character.

At times people apprehend it as a distinction between the so-called "coldness" of "merely intellectual" appeal and the greater stimulativeness of the element of appeal to feeling.

At times people apprehend it as a distinction between appeals that result in "belief" or "acquiescence" only and appeals that move to action.

And at times people apprehend it as a distinction between appeals which consist of the rational validation of ideas and appeals which move us to belief in ways which have to do with feelings and dispositions.

Now, all of these six dualities have some kind and some degree of validity and significance in human experience. And most of them have received consideration and recognition in the literature of rhetoric. But it is the sixth one that has always constituted the foundation of a technically formulated dichotomy of the "means of persuasion." Technically considered, this major duality has always had to do primarily with the distinction between appeals which move us to belief on some sort of a rational foundation and appeals which move us to belief in ways which have to do with the feeling side of our personalities. And this is the duality which we find in the rhetoric of Aristotle.

Stated in greater detail, Aristotle's theory of the duality may be said to be as follows: Beliefs can be established on rational

grounds or on grounds which operate through feeling. This is true as regards discourse as well as regards inquiry. This fact constitutes the basis of our dichotomy. On the first side of this dichotomy we find two important principles, the principle of logical relevancy and the principle of formal validity in reasoning. The first of these principles tells us that it is possible to separate the factors which belong to a rational consideration of an idea from the factors which may influence belief in the idea in extra-rational ways. The second principle tells us that rational soundness can in a very large measure be secured through attention to matters of formal validity in the reasoning process. On the other side of the dichotomy we find the one principle of affective influence, the principle, that is, that the stirring up of suitable attitudes may contribute to or determine the establishment of a belief. All of which taken together justifies the formula that on one side of the dichotomy we have "logical demonstrations of propositions" and on the other side "appeals to passions." This, in brief, is the duality which, according to my conclusions in the "Prolegomena" can become scientifically valid and rhetorically significant if it is reinterpreted in the light of modern knowledge.

Our first question, then, is: What will be the character of this duality after it has received the needed interpretation?

The crucial point of difference between Aristotle's view of the duality and the only tenable modern view lies in the character of the fundamental approach to the subject. When Aristotle tells us that beliefs are determined through rational and through affective factors he believes that these two sets of factors are to a high degree separable from each other. Accordingly, he attempts to separate them and to treat them in a way which suggests that they may be catalogued under two fixed categories. But the possibility of thus separating them has very significant limitations, which, if he recognized them at all, he failed to discuss. If we approach the matter from the knowledge-establishing (logical) angle we can be very much impressed by the fact that a scientist, for example, needs to make it one of his chief concerns that he rule out of consideration all elements which move his disposition without having an objective bearing on his problem. This happens to be a matter of crucial importance in all scientific research. But this segregability is tied up very closely with the principle of objectivity. The moment we are dealing with problems in which objectivity is difficult to secure, or the moment we look at our materials from the angle of persuasion, that moment segregability becomes less clearly possible and may then

amount to mere distinguishability or even less. We must not allow ourselves to be beguiled, therefore, into adopting Aristotelianism without modification. When we say that rhetorical appeal can be dichotomized, that there are two "sides" to it, we must not take that to mean that there are two unconditionally segregable *kinds* of rhetorical appeal. For us the duality cannot mean that. For us it must mean that since there are two grounds of belief, the rational and the affective, there must also be *two ways of estimating the elements of rhetorical appeal, the logical and the psychological.* These two ways may at times make possible distinctions so sharp that they amount practically to identity-differences (as when we say of an address that in one part it deals with the evidence in the case and in another aims to stir up prejudice), but this fact does not constitute the master key to the nature of the duality. Our dichotomy represents two kinds of human need, the need for rational reliability and the need for discoursive effectiveness. It represents not two fixedly separable classes of appeal but two scales for all appeal; not two fixed catalogues but two standards; not unconditional or inevitable separations but important distinctions. A specific item in discourse may be approached from both sides of the dichotomy. It may be appraised both as to its logical (knowledge-establishing) character and worth and as to its psychological (persuasive) character and worth.

Parenthetically, it may be noted at this point that viewed in the perspective of human culture the two sides of our duality represent not merely a technical dichotomy in the influences that make for belief but also two very vital human interests. These interests are, first, knowledge (truth, certainty) and, second, persuasion (moving people to desired beliefs and actions by means of discourse). These interests stand for two sets of values of great importance to mankind; of such importance, indeed, that were rhetoric to ignore a distinction between them it would be worthy of severe condemnation on simple human grounds. Sophistical rhetoric failed to make room for the duality. All it was willing to recognize was persuasion-value. The wiser Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and generations of thoughtful people since their day, have sought to make rhetoric more complete scientifically, more worthy ethically, and more true sociologically by recognizing the interest embodied in the Sophistical emphasis and planting into it a technical treatment of man's interest in solving his problems by means of reliable knowledge. There is here no merely arbitrary adding of logic to persuasion. It is rather a recognition

of the first great flowering of man's ability to solve his problems by critically examined knowledge.

The second item which must figure importantly in our reinterpretation of Aristotle has to do with the problem of the true nature of the *conviction* side of the duality. Aristotle calls it the "logical demonstration of propositions." From the modern point of view this is a very inadequate conception of the matter. We must enlarge it and even change it before we can accept it.

As the founder of logic, Aristotle envisaged for his new science a very comprehensive field. He meant logic to be the analysis of thought, the method of scientific knowing, the formally valid procedure of logical proof, the guarantor of cognitive certainty, and the classification of ultimate reality. (These words are largely Schiller's.) But, for reasons which we cannot discuss here, the early treatments of logic, and Aristotle's own discussion of the logical side of rhetoric, gave the subject of "the formally valid procedure of proof" such prominence and emphasis that not only Aristotle's exposition of the "logical" side of the rhetorical duality but also the world's general conception of what is meant by "logical" are definitely distorted. If logic covers only the subject of "the formally valid procedure of proof" then the category of the "logical," whether applied to thought or discourse, refers chiefly to "consistency," "coherence," "order," "system," or some other cognate quality or characteristic. But this would give us a highly inadequate conception of what is embraced by the concept of knowing, of what is meant by intellectual or rational soundness, and of what the field of logic actually includes. Logic comprehends an analysis of all the factors involved in the business of knowing. When, therefore, we speak of "logicality" in its narrow meaning of "formal validity" we speak of only one restricted phase of the "logical," the phase which has to do with relations between propositions in our judgments. This kind of logicality is real and important, of course; but beyond it is a logicality of a much more comprehensive sort. It is the logicality which involves the knowledge-seeking processes in all their aspects. It refers to all that has to do with the establishing of reliable knowledge, and not to relations between judgments merely. It includes, for example, all the factors of scientific methodology from the business of discovering the data of a problem to the various methods of verification.

Within this larger conception of logic and of logicality lies the important principle of logical relevancy. This principle indicates a distinction between what has a bearing on the evidential establish-

ment of a belief, and what may operate in producing belief in other ways. Mere validity in specific inferences, or mere validity in the relationship of particular propositions, or even the truth of alleged facts taken individually, may not be all that we need to consider. The problem with which we are dealing taken as a whole has a significance here of a very special kind. It represents the *context* within which the various individual factors of logic operate and from which they borrow important aspects of their logicality. In this *context* purposes and standards play an important role. If my purpose is to browbeat a person into believing in the principle of biological evolution I may choose to say, "You must believe in the principle of evolution or you will be regarded as an old fossil." In which case I say something which has real elements of logic in it, both internally and externally. But if my purpose is to show that person that the principle of evolution is scientifically sound, then that statement is distinctly devoid of the highly important "logicality" of *"having a bearing on the evidential determination of a specific belief,"* although it may possess logical consistency within itself. This principle of logical relevancy can be found in Aristotle, but it has only begun to receive an adequate measure of recognition in some modern logical writings. That it deserves much more explicit recognition in discussions of rhetorical theory must go without extensive demonstration, for it plays an essential role in determining what under specific circumstances may be regarded as logical whether in a narrower sense it does live up to certain lesser logical requirements or not.

The *conviction* side of our duality must be thought of in terms of this larger conception of what is embraced by the terms "logic" and "logical." The fact that the realm of the logical is so vast, so complex, and so easily misapprehended makes it necessary that we recognize in the concept of the *logical* at least three distinct meanings, or, let us say, three logicalities. The first is the logicality which signifies relevancy to the specific cognitive situation. The second is the logicality which refers to the principle of rightness in the factors of knowing taken comprehensively. The third is the logicality which refers merely to formal or structural validity in our reasoning. In reinterpreting Aristotle's conception of the first side of the duality, therefore, we must break away from mere tradition in logic as well as in rhetoric.

Our own formula for the *conviction* side of the duality must, therefore, be this: The *conviction* side of rhetorical appeal represents

rhetorical *appeal as subjected or subject to logical testing.* This logical testing may represent merely the elements of consistency or coherence which can be sought in all verbal expression whether its basic appeal is rational or affective. It may, however, represent a rigidity of selection as sharp as that which occurs in science. And it may represent the principle of soundness or rightness as found in any aspect of our concern with reliable knowledge.

The third item in our reinterpretation of Aristotle has to do with the problem of the true nature of the *persuasion* side of our duality. Aristotle places all appeals of this kind under the category of "appeals to the passions." From our point of view this conception of *persuasion* is quite unsatisfactory.

The first fault with Aristotle's conception lies in the category itself. It is highly inadequate both in what it literally denotes and in what it connotes. The term "passions" is for us useless in this connection because of its anachronism. It no longer refers to what Aristotle subsumed under it. We can understand it adequately only in the perspective of history. But even the category as a whole lacks the capacity for pointing out all that must be meant by it.

The second fault lies in the fact that Aristotle thinks of this side of the duality as representing something altogether accessory to the *conviction* phase of the duality. This is very often true. Perhaps it should be true much more often than it is in real practice. But many addresses are primarily of the nature of "appeal to feeling" and quite legitimately so.

The third fault lies in the underlying assumption of the already discussed principle of general segregability. The *persuasion* side of our duality represents a standard, a measure, an approach, not always a class of things. It represents the fact that influences to belief can be approached and tested in terms of their psychological effectiveness. The principle of *persuasion* taken by itself and without analysis does not even imply a dichotomy in the sense in which the principle of *conviction* implies it.

Our own formula for the *persuasion* side of the duality must be this: The *persuasion* side of rhetorical appeal represents *rhetorical appeal as subjected or subject to psychological testing.* This psychological testing may represent merely those elements of rhetorical influence which function as factors accessory to a dominantly logical content in a discourse. It may represent an appraisal of the whole content of a discourse even when that content has already been appraised for its logical worth. And it may represent all influences

to favorable or unfavorable audience response in a communicator-audience situation as a whole.

Our reinterpretation of Aristotle is now complete. But so is, incidentally, our exposition of the duality, for while in the act of reinterpreting the original we have formularized our own conception of the two sides of rhetorical appeal. Thus the first part of our analysis seems to require no further treatment.

However, let us pause a bit before we turn our attention to the next task. It is true that in view of the extensiveness of these reinterpretations a question may properly be raised as to how much of Aristotelianism we have retained. It does seem as if this newly-elaborated duality had very little, if anything, of Aristotle's conception in it. The answer to this question is that the impression of complete departure from the original is misleading. The essence of Aristotelianism lies in this: The Stagirite came upon the rhetorical scene when Sophistical rhetoric held sway. This rhetoric stood very largely for one test of rhetorical appeals only, the psychological one. It concerned itself mainly with effects on audiences. Aristotle, deeply involved in the human struggle for reliability in knowing, introduced into rhetoric the standards which he found essential in reasoning, and gave them a primary place in his system. These standards made a dichotomization of rhetorical appeals as inevitable as it made inevitable the more definite dichotomization of the grounds of belief. And this is the point in Aristotelianism which we have retained in our conceptions of the duality. Human beings concern themselves with the values of persuasion taken in the purely rhetorical sense of the term. But they also concern themselves with the business of solving their problems on the basis of reliable knowledge. And since this concern cannot be kept out of rhetoric it forces upon rhetoric the same distinctions which it forces upon logic.

The Rowell-Aristotle Duality and Psychology

But, what of this duality and the psychology of the audient? Does the duality arise or function in the audient's response to a discourse? If it does, what form does it take?

The simplest way of approaching this matter is through an analysis of what happens in the experience we call belief. Basically, belief is doubtless non-rational in nature. There is no one mechanism which is responsible for it. The forces or factors which precipitate it are almost too varied for successful enumeration. Taken as an act it represents, somehow, the reaction of a personality

as a whole. Habits, feelings, sentiments, biases, loyalties, facts, ideas, ideals, tastes, and all that vast complex which goes under the name of our culture—all these factors have some part in the shaping and precipitation of it. But reasoning, whether as rationalization or as critical reflection, is by no means a stranger to the process. We do very often come to believe because of careful, objectively-tested thinking. And this is true whether we arrive at our beliefs with or without the benefit of oratory.

As a means to a further analysis of this matter let us imagine three examples of how beliefs may develop in actual experience.

Let us suppose, first, that I am a kind of a Henry George, a man who is driven by a desire to solve the problem of taxation. I am an inquirer. As such I am subject to a thousand influences, social, temperamental, cultural, and of other kinds. But, being determined to find a solution to my problem which will approximate the reliability of a solution in science I am quite critical of what I let influence me. I know the force of prejudice and I try to check it out. I know the fascination with which an idea may influence the mind and I try to rivet my attention on establishable facts. Very early in my search I hit upon the idea of the Single Tax. It is not exactly my own idea, but I have come upon it through real thinking of my own. I size it up in the light of all the facts that come to mind and it looks very plausible. But as days and weeks go by I discover many objections to the theory. I meet them one by one by adapting my theory to them or overthrowing the objections. At times I feel a peculiarly strong inclination to accept the theory because I discover a highly respected writer who leans in the same direction, but I am aware that that does not furnish objective evidence. I discover, too, that the longer I entertain the theory the more I am disposed to cling to it, but I am capable of exerting my will to be guided by valid evidence only. At last I experience that sense of release which signifies the final elimination of inhibition. At that point I turn reformer and begin to preach my doctrines to the world.

Did the principles of the duality function in this experience? They did, decidedly. I distinguished between what meets the highest standards for knowing and what falls outside those standards. I recognized the existence of non-logical or extra-logical influences in my thinking and tried deliberately to nullify their power over me.

Next, let us suppose that I am a man of much the same capacities and attitudes as characterize this fictitious Henry George, but that I am too fully occupied in other ways to make the subject of taxa-

tion a matter of systematic inquiry. I am a good thinker. I have a considerable degree of culture. I possess a great deal of information in matters economic. But I am in such a position that instead of reading much and thinking much about the problem in question I find it necessary to attend an occasional lecture on the subject. And so I go to listen to a lecture on the Single Tax by a famous Single Taxer. I sit in a room with several hundred other men and I listen with eagerness. I am still an inquirer. I am capable of discriminating between the logically relevant and the irrelevant in most of the materials of this subject. I am able to detect many kinds of unsoundness in the argument that may be presented. But in this situation I am not an inquirer in the usual sense of the term, because I am a member of a group which is being influenced by an orator who has made it his concern to win thousands to his point of view. I am greatly interested in the subject but the orator makes that interest glow. I am ready to exert myself to attend to what is said, but the orator holds my attention almost hypnotically. The speaker handles the subject technically, for the most part, but I follow him easily and respect him for the scrupulousness with which he tries to bring out the truth. At times he stirs up some of my prejudices but I am alert to that and inhibit my response. I am able to recognize fairly well what in the address possesses logical relevancy and soundness and what inclines me to belief on other than logical grounds. When the lecture is over I feel I have been won over to the theory of the Single Tax. I also feel as if I had been under a spell. I am enthusiastic about my new belief and feel like sharing it with others. But there is a second stage in the experience of every audient, a stage in which some of the spell of the auditorium wears off. This begins to happen to me the following day. I am somewhat less certain now of my new belief. Days pass, however, and as I think over the matter the belief which I experienced on the night of the lecture with a glow of feeling attains new life within a soberer mood.

Did the principles of the duality function in this experience? They did. They functioned in the processes of discrimination, criticism, inhibition, and selection.

Finally, let us suppose that I am a much more ordinary citizen. I am interested in the problem of taxation in only a general way. All the ideas I have about it have come to me from snatches of conversation with different people. I am prejudiced against "highbrows," and "radicals," and "fancy" solutions of public problems. I can discriminate between straight and crooked thinking in relation

to simple practical matters with which I have some familiarity but I have never in my life carried out a systematic project of inquiry outside the realm of my own practical everyday affairs. I have come to listen to a lecturer on the Single Tax because his name has been much on people's lips and because my daughter has wanted the house to herself and I have had to go somewhere. I listen to this lecturer and find him not only interesting but even entertaining. I can understand almost everything he says. I follow his argument and it seems perfectly convincing to me. I share in applauding the clever remarks the lecturer makes about absentee owners of unimproved land. As the lecturer proceeds I become more and more his partisan. He is right. He is a man I could follow into battle. I am surely going to vote for the Single Tax if the measure is ever put upon a ballot.

This situation is of a kind which is usually held to be more typical of the communicator-audience relationship. Here almost everything seems to depend upon the speaker. He has to secure attention. He has to create interest in his ideas. He has to overcome or make use of latent urges or prejudices or habits of mind. He has to speak to people whose ability to follow a technical discussion of the subject is very limited. He is probably the only person present who is in any considerable degree capable of discerning the subtler distinctions demanded in logic and who is aware that some of his appeal has merely persuasion as against proof value. And, I, the listener, accept his ideas for reasons the psychology of which I do not understand. What, then, of the duality in this situation? Did it arise here in my experience as an audient? It certainly did not in its full stature. It functioned here only to the extent to which I could recognize logical or persuasion values in the address. It is even possible that it did not arise at all. But, in such a case the address, although it was not *subjected* to the appraisals implied in the principle of the duality did nevertheless remain *subject* to such appraisals.

These three examples make it evident that the key to the operation of the duality in the experience of the audient is much the same as the key to the operation of the duality in the experience of the thinker. Belief may be grounded in feeling or in rationality. It is usually grounded in both. Rationality is not something that operates independently of the non-rational. Nor is it mere inference-making. It involves an effort to discount feeling. It represents criticism, inhibition, testing, selection, combination, and ordering. Whenever an

audient listens to an address with a discriminative response which actively judges what is said he gives the essentials of the duality real being. Whenever he fails to do this the duality is only potentially there.

It is evident, therefore, that the duality may enter into the communicator-audient situtaion from the side of the communicator or of the audient or both. And it is quite possible to account for it psychologically when we consider it from the angle of audience response.

And, now, what of the duality and psychological monism? Is there a conflict between the two conceptions? Not at all. After all, what is this "big, bad wolf" of psychological monism? Taken negatively, it is simply a repudiation of the old faculty psychology which talked of reasoning as the work of *a reason,* of willing as the work of *a will,* and so forth. Taken positively, it is a recognition of the functional approach to psychological processes, an approach which views men as unified reaction-systems which can exert the functions called reasoning, feeling, willing, and so forth. Psychological monism makes no denial of the reality of the time-honored distinctions between reasoning, feeling, and willing. All it denies is the idea that these forms of behavior are expressions of individual faculties. This monism is as pluralistic as it is monistic. It talks as easily of reasoning, feeling, and willing as did any psychology before it and as does all commonsense. It does not give the modern psychologist any of the trouble that it seems to have given some of our rhetoricians. It makes room for every aspect of our newly-interpreted duality.

Concluding Remarks

To those readers of this journal who have thought much concerning the problems of rhetorical theory it will be quite obvious that in the above I have presented a mere outline of the analysis which our subject demands. The matter is far from simple. It should continue to challenge the scholarship in our profession for many years. It might well lead to the writing of many books. My own hope is that in the present article I have at least suggested the direction in which the full solution of our problem really lies.

MATTHEW ARNOLD: THE CRITIC AS RHETORICIAN

EVERETT LEE HUNT
Swarthmore College

MATTHEW ARNOLD'S reputation now rests upon his poetry and upon his criticism of literature. To his contemporaries he may have appeared to be, as Professor Garrod suggests, a successful writer upon educational, political and theological subjects who had once written poetry which nobody read, and who from time to time wrote literary criticism which not very many people read. But no one takes this view now, and Professor Garrod is the only contemporary critic I have found who seems to recognize the truth that the *Essays in Criticism* were by-products of a talent interested primarily in something else. And even Professor Garrod writes:

> Most of the questions in which Matthew Arnold was interested no longer interest anybody. His theological writings are, save so far as he is our only artist in theology, no longer vital. When he first wrote on education, there was none—it is perhaps not his fault that there is now too much. How changed is the face of politics and society I need not say; if there is any real break in the continuity of English political history, it falls between Matthew Arnold and ourselves. . . . A hundred years hence Arnold's writings will be interesting from their readability and from their temper, the temper of a man of letters consistently looking at the world in the manner which literature had taught him.[1]

I cannot agree with this dictum that most of Arnold's prose now possesses historical interest only, and it does not come within the limits of this essay to dispute with those critics who insist that the significance of Arnold's poetry and literary criticism has now also become historical. I am content with citing Professor Garrod's view as the typically literary one that permanence is a *sine qua non* of value, that the glory of literature is that it endures, while scientific hypotheses and social theories become transformed and absorbed. It is not strange, then, that most of Arnold's prose is dismissed by critics as mere rhetoric, and is ascribed to those lamentable weaknesses which lead genius to waste its abilities.

To the student of rhetoric, apparently, most of Arnold's prose is consigned, and such a student will have his reward; but beyond that I shall show, I think, that the literary critic may have a better under-

[1] *Poetry and the Criticism of Life*, Harvard Press, 1931, p. 80.

standing of Arnold and of the art of criticism if he will be less careful of his literary boundaries.

DeQuincey, who had given some days and nights to Aristotle, classifies rhetoric into an *ars utens* and an *ars docens*.[2] For the purpose of this essay I should like to add a third type which DeQuincey also discussed in an introductory paragraph, namely, the abuses of writing and speaking which in general are adequately condemned when referred to as mere rhetoric. These distinctions will be clear, I believe, if they are here treated (in reverse order) as the rhetoric which Arnold attacked, the rhetoric he taught, and the rhetoric he used in his own appeals to the public.

The Aristotelian conception of rhetoric, so familiar to DeQuincey, has largely disappeared from contemporary criticism, but to most readers of this journal it will not be necessary to amplify the statement that in studying Arnold as a rhetorician it is primarily the Aristotelian rhetoric I have in mind. This rhetoric was not in Arnold's mind, apparently, for all his evident familiarity with Plato, with Aristotle's *Ethics* and *Politics*, and for all his father's love of the *Rhetoric*.[3] In considering Arnold's attacks on rhetoric it is his own, the prevalent and popular conception, that we are discussing. In the other divisions the connotations of the term change to the Aristotelian. I should use the term criticism in a general sense if I could rest upon any such clear conception as we have of the Aristotelian rhetoric, but this unfortunately is not the case. It will be safer to limit ourselves to the Arnoldian criticism, and to say that the relation of Aristotelian rhetoric to Arnoldian criticism will be fairly clear if it is recognized that the study of the means which the critic takes

[2] Essay on Rhetoric, (Masson ed., Edinb. 1890), Vol. XI. See also H. H. Hudson, "DeQuincey on Rhetoric and Public Speaking," *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of J. A. Winans* (1925).

[3] A. P. Stanley, *Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold* (London, 1881), p. 16: "But his passion at the time I am treating of was for Aristotle and Thucydides; . . . those who knew him intimately or corresponded with him will bear me witness how deeply he was imbued with the language and ideas of the former; how in earnest conversation, or in writing, his train of thought was affected by the *Ethics* and *Rhetoric;* how he cited the maxims of the Stagyrite as oracles, and how his language was quaintly and racily pointed with phrases from him."

In a letter to Mr. Justice Coleridge, dated June 26, 1841, Thomas Arnold writes: "We have been reading some of the Rhetoric in the Sixth Form this half year, and its immense value struck me again so forcibly that I could not consent to send my son to an University where he would lose it altogether." *Ibid.*, II, 224.

to commend to the public the best that has been said and thought in the world belongs to the province of rhetoric. A rigorous intellectual discussion of whether what is commended really is the best that has been said and thought belongs to criticism, or in Aristotelian terms, to dialectic.[4] Where, as in Arnold's case, the critic freely employs what Aristotle calls the topics, or commonplaces of rhetoric, it will be necessary to separate the rhetoric from the criticism and attempt to relate them.

How great a part rhetoric plays in Arnoldian criticism is clear from the conclusion of "Sweetness and Light."

> The great men of culture are those who have had a passion for diffusing, for making prevail, for carrying from one end of society to the other, the best knowledge, the best ideas of their time; who have laboured to divest knowledge of all that was harsh, uncouth, difficult, abstract, professional, exclusive; to humanize it, to make it efficient outside the clique of the cultivated and learned, yet still remaining the *best* knowledge and thought of the time.[5]

Arnold apparently felt that the men who carry the best knowledge from one end of society to the other might also be the men to determine whether or not it was the best knowledge. The processes of discovery and of persuasion were often, to Arnold, identical. He was quite capable of defending an unsystematic method of presentation by an appeal to the intuitive method of discovering truth. But he was also willing to acknowledge his indebtedness to scholars when he was popularizing their work, insisting only that he transformed their results with his literary tact and a quick perception, the result of wide, humane reading. With the growth of specialization the contributions of "literary tact" to any study are viewed with suspicion, and the Arnoldian critic is accused of being a purveyor of literary loose talk, a practitioner of the higher charlatanry.[6] This essay, then, is only a beginning of a more general study of the relations of criticism, rhetoric, and scientific method.

I

It was the fact that Arnold did appeal to the public that gives us the opportunity to study him as a rhetorician. For Walter Pater, the critic was a scholar writing for scholars; the cultivation of his

[4] For this distinction between rhetoric and dialectic, see E. L. Hunt, "Dialectic, A Neglected Method of Argument," *Q.J.S.E.*, VII (1921), 221-32.

[5] *Culture and Anarchy*, Smith Elder and Co., London, 1889, p. 31.

[6] See Max Eastman, *The Literary Mind* (1931), and J. M. Robertson, *Modern Humanists Reconsidered* (London, 1927).

readers, if not his own taste, would forbid his use of the more obvious tricks of rhetoric; he removed himself entirely, or liked to think that he did, from the realms of the charlatan. But Matthew Arnold, like Gilbert and Sullivan, addressed the "lower middle classes"; like Socrates, he talked in the market place about conduct; and like Socrates, too, he was in danger of being called a sophist. It is not strange that Plato's distinctions between the philosopher and the rhetorician were constantly in Arnold's mind. He competed with Cobden and Bright, Spurgeon and Gladstone, Moody and Sankey, even, for the attention of the British Philistine; but he wanted it understood that he did it with a difference. He liked to quote Plato's remark that Socrates was the only true politician in Athens. This applied to himself, Arnold seems to have felt; but he preferred to be known as a critic.

The basis of Arnold's attacks upon the rhetoricians, among whom he included most of the contemporary journalists and political leaders, was the Platonic conception of rhetoric as a flattery.[7] He summarizes Plato for his readers in his *Higher Schools and Universities in Germany*.[8]

> Nay, as Socrates amusingly said, the man who defers to clap-trap and the man who uses his intelligence are, when they meet in the struggle of active politics, like a doctor and a confectioner competing for the suffrages of a constituency of schoolboys; the confectioner has nearly every point in his favor. The confectioner deals in all that the constituency like; the doctor is the man who hurts them, and makes them leave off what they like and take what is disagreeable. And accordingly the temptation, in dealing with the public and with the trade of active politics, the temptation to be a confectioner is extremely strong, and we see that almost all leading newspapers and leading politicians do in fact yield to it.

This Arnold develops further as one of the reasons why journalistic comparisons of domestic and foreign institutions can rarely be trusted. The journalist is a confectioner intent on pleasing his own readers; all comparisons must and do flatter the home country and the truth is not in them. Various critics have suggested that Arnold was not above rhetoric in pointing his own comparisons the other way, and he might, I think, have admitted this, but with the Platonic reply that if there was some deception in his rhetoric it was for the good of his countrymen.

The national habit of self-deception by laying a flattering unction

[7] See Plato's *Gorgias*.
[8] London, 1882, p. 216.

to the soul is, by a rather peculiar use of the term *pedantic* (borrowed from Goethe), attributed to the English people as characteristic of their treatment of the Irish.

> No, the English are pedants, and will proceed in the way of pedantry as long as they can. They will not ask themselves what really meets the wants of a case, but they will ask what may be done without offending the prejudices of their classes and parties, and then they will agree to say to one another and to the world that this is what really meets the wants of the case, and that it is the only thing to be done.[9]

The systematic development of the baneful effects of rhetoric as a flattery is to be found in *Culture and Anarchy*. It is true that the habits and instincts of the British do not tend to make them spontaneous lovers of sweetness and light, but they might be brought to it with the aid of a few effective critics, if it were not that the rhetoricians constantly flatter them into contentment with their imperfect condition. The critic gives us what we need so lamentably in these anarchic times, a real principle of authority in the state as the affirmation of our best selves, of national right reason. Such a state knows no classes and operates to encourage the pursuit of perfection. It overlooks and overcomes the very ordinary selves of the Barbarians, the Philistines and the Populace, who, when acting at the dictates of the ordinary self, struggle to govern the state in the interests of class. But rhetoricians keep themselves in power by flattering the weaknesses of each of the classes, their natural dislike of any authority but their own, their natural leaning toward lawlessness and bathos. Because of these rhetoricians, and Arnold often names them,

> The Barbarians remain in the belief that the great broad-shouldered Englishman may well be satisfied with himself; the Philistines remain in the belief that the great middle class of this country, with its earnest common-sense penetrating through sophisms and ignoring common-places, may well be satisfied with itself; the Populace, that the working man, with his bright powers of sympathy and ready powers of action, may well be satisfied with himself. . . . Thus everything in our political life tends to hide from us that there is anything wiser than our ordinary selves, and to prevent our getting the notion of a paramount right reason.[10]

Not only are the weaknesses of particular classes and organizations flattered by the rhetoricians, but those weaknesses which extend through all classes of society are made the common topics of patriotic

[9] *Irish Essays* (1882), p. 32.
[10] *Culture and Anarchy*, London, 1889, pp. 76, 78.

oratory to the great increase of national complacency. Doctrines and pursuits entirely unworthy of a place as ends in themselves receive the blessings of the rhetoricians. All of those discouraging phenomena to be classed under the heading of machinery—worship of irresponsible freedom, the pursuit of wealth, of bodily health and vigor, of increase of population, the energetic activities of religious and political organizations—all these come to be valued as ends in themselves because of the rhetoricians, some of whom know no better, but many of whom are industriously grinding axes of their own.

As Arnold proceeds in his attack upon the enemies of culture it becomes more and more apparent that every one of these enemies receives aid and comfort from the rhetoricians, that Arnold regards the critic as a sort of Socratic gad-fly to sting the national complacency, and that the contrast between the rhetorician and the cultured critic had its prototype in Plato's contrast between the rhetorician and the philosopher. The citation of Socrates as the exemplar for the critic, at the conclusion of *Culture and Anarchy*, would seem to warrant the belief that Arnold was quite consciously drawing his criticism of the British from Plato's indictment of the Athenians. I do not understand why he chose Pericles as the orator when he might have heightened the contrast by choosing an obviously sophistical speaker, unless in his enthusiasm he meant to condemn all oratory.

> Pericles was perhaps the most perfect public speaker who ever lived, for he was the man who most perfectly combined thought and wisdom with feeling and eloquence. Yet Plato brings in Alcibiades declaring, that men went away from the oratory of Pericles, saying it was very fine, it was very good, and afterwards thinking no more about it; but they went away from hearing Socrates talk, he says, with the point of what he had said sticking fast in their minds, and they could not get rid of it. Socrates has drunk his hemlock and is dead; but in his own breast does not every man carry about a possible Socrates, in that power of a disinterested play of consciousness upon his stock notions and habits, of which this wise and admirable man gave all through his lifetime the great example, and which was the secret of his incomparable influence? And he who leads men to call forth and exercise themselves in this power, and who busily calls it forth and exercises it in himself, is at the present moment, perhaps, as Socrates was in his time, more in concert with the vital workings of men's minds, and more effectually significant, than any House of Commons orator, or practical operator in politics.[11]

Macaulay always seemed to Arnold to carry the spirit of the "practical operator in politics" into literature, and the references to

[11] *Ibid.*, 165.

him are usually by way of deprecating his influence as a rhetorician. He was unfair to Macaulay at times, but in his discussion of the famous essay on Milton the distinction between rhetoric and criticsm transcends the attack upon any particular writer, and asserts that flattery in the realm of culture is quite as powerful as in the sphere of political action.

> Human progress consists in a continual increase in the number of those, who, ceasing to live by the animal life alone and to feel the pleasure of sense only, come to participate in the intellectual life also, and to find enjoyment in the things of the mind. The enjoyment is not at first very discriminating. Rhetoric, brilliant writing, gives to such persons pleasure for its own sake; but it gives them pleasure, still more, when it is employed in commendation of a view of life which is on the whole theirs, and of men and causes with which they are naturally in sympathy. The immense popularity of Macaulay is due to his being preëminently fitted to give pleasure to all who are beginning to feel enjoyment in the things of the mind. It is said that the traveler in Australia, visiting one settler's hut after another finds again and again that the settler's third book, after the Bible and Shakespeare, is some work by Macaulay. Nothing can be more natural. The Bible and Shakespeare may be said to be imposed upon an Englishman as objects of his admiration; but as soon as the common English, desiring culture, begins to choose for himself, he chooses Macaulay. Macaulay's view of things is, on the whole, the view of them which he feels to be his own also; the persons and causes praised are those which he himself is disposed to admire; the persons and causes blamed are those with which he is out of sympathy; and the rhetoric employed to praise or blame them is animating and excellent. Macaulay is thus a great civilizer. In hundreds of men he hits their nascent taste for the things of the mind, possesses himself of it and stimulates it, draws it powerfully forth and confirms it. But with the increasing number of those who awake to the intellectual life, the number of those also increases, who, having awoke to it follow where it leads them. And it leads them to see that it is their business to learn the truth about the important men, and things, and books, which interest the human mind. For thus is gradually to be acquired a stock of sound ideas, in which the mind will habitually move, and which alone can give to our judgments security and solidity. To be satisfied with fine writing about the objects of one's study, with having it praised or blamed in accordance with one's own likes or dislikes, with any conventional treatment of it whatever, is at this stage of growth seen to be futile. At this stage, rhetoric, even when it is as good as Macaulay's, dissatisfies. And the number of people who have reached this stage of mental growth is constantly, as things are now, increasing. . . . So that while the number of those who are delighted with rhetoric is always increasing, the number of those who are dissatisfied with it is always increasing, too.[12]

[12] "A French Critic on Milton." *Mixed Essays* (London, 1880), p. 244. This classical passage in the criticism of rhetoric should have set beside it the vigorous defense of Macaulay as a lover of common people who made them love literature, which is called forth from Henry Sidgwick. See his attack on

Macaulay, Arnold regards as a "born rhetorician" who lacks all the qualities of a critic. There are critics, however, and good ones, who, though not born rhetoricians, have hurt their criticism by speaking the language of rhetoric. This is as much an indictment of the British people as it is of the critics. In France it is not necessary for a critic to adopt the rhetorical violence of the "provincial spirit":

> M. Planche's advantage is, that he feels himself to be speaking before competent judges, that there is a force of cultivated opinion for him to appeal to. Therefore he must not be extravagant, and he need not storm; he must satisfy the reason and the taste, that is his business. Mr. Palgrave, on the other hand, feels himself to be speaking before a promiscuous multitude, with the few good judges so scattered through it as to be powerless; therefore, he has no calm confidence and no self-control; he relies on the strength of his lungs, he knows that big words impose on the mob, and that, even if he is outrageous, most of his audience are apt to be a great deal more so.[13]

This might be a characterization of the methods of Mr. Mencken rather than those of a gentle anthologist; the description of the results of this style is even more applicable to the Mencken school. The cause in both cases is the same, a critical intelligence, speaking on issues of criticism, but using the rhetorical language of the hustings. Such a style

> does not persuade, it makes war; it has no urbanity, the tone of the city, of the centre, the tone which always aims at spiritual and intellectual effect, and not excluding the use of banter, never disjoins banter itself from politeness, from felicity. . . . Even if its view is right, the note is violence; for abandoning the true mode of intellectual action—persuasion, the instilment of conviction,—it simply astounds and irritates the hearer by contradicting without a word of proof or preparation, his fixed and familiar notions; and this is mere violence.[14]

But even worse than the lack of persuasiveness is the critic's loss of ability to see things as they are when he rushes into practical affairs with the vehemence of the rhetorician.

> A polemical practical criticism makes men blind even to the ideal imperfection of their practise, makes them willingly assert its ideal perfection, in order better to secure it against attack.[15]

Arnold entitled "The Prophet of Culture," *Macmillan's Magazine*, Vol. XVI, 1867, p. 278.

[13] "The Literary Influence of Academies," *Essays in Criticism*, First series (London, 1902), p. 74.

[14] *Ibid.*, 72.

[15] "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time," *ibid.*, p. 21.

Cobbett, "blackened as he is with the smoke of a life-long conflict in the field of political practice," Carlyle, "after his furious raid into the field with his *Latter Day Pamphlets*," and Ruskin, "after his pugnacious political economy," have sacrificed their power to see things as they are, and would be generally misunderstood if they even attempted to return to the method of sweet reasonableness.

Rhetoricians, then, as practical men of action, are so given to flattering the ordinary selves of the Barbarians, Philistines and Populace, that the voice of the critic, urging them to the pursuit of perfection, is hardly heard. But the critic, with his more sensitive audience, must not adopt the tone and manner of the rhetorician, lest he lose both truth and persuasiveness.

II

Indignant at the victories of flattery, many honest souls have denounced persuasion and all its works. Plato has made Socrates a hero in the eyes of the generations by a rhetorical account of the bravery with which the philosopher, at his great trial, denounced the methods of the rhetoricians and irritated an Athenian jury into sentencing him to death. But even Plato afterward admitted that there might be a noble rhetoric by which people could be persuaded of that which was acceptable to God and the philosophers. This nobility of purpose explains the seriousness with which Arnold regarded his own persuasiveness, or as I shall call it, his rhetoric.

Arnold was singularly free from pose and affectation in his letters to his family, and I shall cite two letters to show the seriousness of his purpose in attempting to influence public opinion in England. These and similar utterances are taken by some contemporary critics as an indication of a Messiah complex in Arnold's mind, but I am not now so much concerned with contemporary attitudes toward high seriousness as I am with establishing the basis of what I shall call Arnold's rhetorical purpose. In January, 1865, when most of his reputation was still to be achieved, Arnold wrote his sister, "K":

> Indeed, I am convinced that *Science*, in the widest sense of the word, meaning a knowledge of things as the basis of our operations, becomes, as it does become, more of a power in the world, the weight of the nations and men who have carried the intellectual life farthest will be more and more felt; indeed, I see signs of this already. That England may run well in this race is my deepest desire; and to stimulate her and to make her feel how many clogs she wears, and how much she has to do in order to run it as her genius gives her power to run, is the object of all I do.[16]

[16] *Letters of Matthew Arnold* (ed. by G. W. Russell, London, 1901), I, 285.

In November of the same year, Arnold wrote another sister, "Fan":

I have a conviction that there is a real, an almost imminent danger of England losing immeasurably in all ways, declining into a sort of greater Holland, for want of what I must call ideas, for want of perceiving how the world is going and must go, and preparing herself accordingly. This conviction haunts me, and at times overwhelms me with depression; I would rather not live to see the change come to pass, for we shall all deteriorate under it. While there is time I shall do all I can, and in every way, to prevent its coming to pass. Sometimes, no doubt, turning oneself one way after another, one must make unsuccessful and unwise hits, and one may fail after all; but try I must, and I know that it is only by facing in every direction that one can win the day.[17]

Beside these expressions of serious resolve should be placed certain earlier expressions of doubt and dissatisfaction with his direct assault upon public opinion. A year earlier he had written Grant Duff:

One is from time to time seized and irresistibly carried along by the temptation to treat political, or religious, or social matters, directly; but after yielding to such a temptation I always feel myself recoiling again, and disposed to touch them only so far as they can be touched through poetry.[18]

Two years before this, in 1862, he had written his mother:

I had much rather avoid all the sphere of dispute. One begins by saying something, and if one believes it to be true one cannot well resist the pleasure of expanding it when it is controverted; but I had rather live in purer air than that of controversy, and when I have done two more things I must do—an article on Middle Class Education, and one on Academies (such as the French Academy) both of which will raise opposition and contradiction—I mean to leave this region altogether and to devote myself wholly to what is positive and happy, not negative and contentious, in literature.[19]

And in 1861, he wrote:

I must finish off for the present my critical writings between this and forty, and give the next ten years earnestly to poetry. It is my last chance. It is not a bad ten years of one's life if one resolutely uses it, but it is a time in which, if one does not use it, one dries up and becomes prosaic altogether.[20]

Toward the end of his life, when it had become evident that he would not add to the production of his earlier years in poetry, and that the energy remaining to him after his retirement from his school

[17] *Ibid.*, I, 360.
[18] *Ibid.*, I, 270.
[19] *Ibid.*, I, 184.
[20] *Ibid.*, I, 165.

inspectorship would continue to be spent in addressing the public on general questions, how did he feel about it? In 1887, when he was sixty-four, and had expressed various premonitions that he had not much longer to live, he wrote Charles Eliot Norton:

> I do not know whether I shall do any more poetry, but it is something to be of use in prose, and by coming out from time to time as the organ of "the body of quiet, reasonable people," I believe I do some good.[21]

This conflict in Arnold's mind, with the progressive victory for persuasive prose, is not adequately explained nor sympathetically treated by the literary critics, and it is not a problem that calls for discussion here except to say that Arnold would not have devoted so much energy to his social, political and theological criticism if he had agreed with the scholars of his day, and many of the scholar-critics of ours, on the unimportance of persuading the public of anything. The sense of what he was losing in poetry may have strengthened his tendency to see himself saving England with his prose, but his veiw of persuasion as an aspect of character and an instrument of truth, in which he was virtually taking up the canse of Isocrates against Plato,[22] is needed by critics who regard their function as purely aesthetic.

The rhetoric which Arnold taught in this campaign for culture in England, he taught chiefly to himself in his reflections upon persuasion and persuasiveness. The Letters continue to be the chief source. In October, 1863, shortly after he has had some evidence that his essay on Heine had been well received, he wrote his mother:

> It is very animating to think that one at last has a chance of *getting at* the English public. Such a public as it is, and such a work as one wants to do with it! Partly nature, partly time and study have also by this time taught me thoroughly the precious truth that everything turns upon one's exercising the power of *persuasion, of charm;* that without this all fury, energy, reasoning, power, acquirement, are thrown away and only render their owner more miserable. Even in one's ridicule one must preserve a sweetness and good humour.[23]

In November of the same year he writes his sister, Mrs. Forster,

[21] *Ibid.*, II, 429.

[22] See Russell Wagner, "Rhetorical Theory of Isocrates," *Q.J.S.E.*, VIII (1922), 323-37; also George Norlin's introduction to his translations of Isocrates in the Loeb Classical Library (1928).

[23] *Letters*, I, 234. All the italics in the citations in this essay are Arnold's. His habit of italics has been much criticized. It seems to suggest that he heard his words.

that he will do what he can in literature to further the movement her husband is supporting in Parliament:

> . . . with the risk always before me that if I cannot charm the wild beast of Philistinism while I am trying to convert him, of being torn to pieces by him.[24]

Again in January, 1864, he wrote her:

> I have the second part of my *French Eton* in this next *Macmillan*. It will take a third part to finish it. In this part I am really labouring hard to *persuade*, and have kept myself from all which might wound, provoke or frighten, with a solicitude which I think you will hardly fail to perceive, and which will perhaps amuse you; but to school oneself to this forbearance is an excellent discipline if one does it for the right objects.[25]

This disciplinary aspect of the attempt to be persuasive recalls the view of Isocrates that in the attempt to be persuasive one becomes virtuous. Arnold repeats his idea in a letter written the same month to his mother, replying to her compliments on his *Joubert*:

> I would far rather have it said how delightful and interesting a man Joubert was than how brilliant my article is. In the long run one makes enemies by having one's brilliancy and ability praised; one can only get oneself really accepted by men by making oneself forgotten in the people and the doctrines one recommends. I have had this much before my mind in doing the second part of my *French Eton*. I really want to *persuade* on this subject, and I have felt how necessary it was to keep down many and many sharp and telling things that rise to one's lips, and which one would gladly utter if one's object was to show one's abilities. . . . I think such an effort a moral discipline of the very best sort for one.[26]

The moral discipline of the attempt to be persuasive is the first of Arnold's important generalizations about persuasion. The second is that the intuitive as opposed to the logical method of persuasion is best both for discovering and for teaching truth. Writing to his mother in December, 1864, Arnold discusses a vigorous attack made upon his "Function of Criticism" by FitzJames Stephen.[27]

> His complaint that I do not argue reminds me of dear old Edward, who always says when any of his family do not go his way, that they do not reason. However, my sinuous, easy, unpolemical mode of proceeding has been adopted by me, first, because I really think it the best way of proceeding if one wants to get at, and keep with, truth; secondly, because I am convinced that only by

[24] *Ibid.*, I, 240.
[25] *Ibid.*, I, 250.
[26] *Ibid.*, I, 255.
[27] "Mr. Matthew Arnold and his Countrymen," *Saturday Review*, December 3, 1864. Reprinted in Stephen's *Horae Sabbaticae* (London, 1892).

a literary form of this kind being given to them can ideas such as mine ever gain any access in a country such as ours.[28]

Another statement of this method, often quoted, is at the conclusion of the introduction to *Culture and Anarchy*.

> Therefore I propose now to try to inquire, in the simple unsystematic way which best suits my taste, what culture really is.

When Frederic Harrison took Arnold to task in the best of satires on culture for his want of systematic reasoning,[29] Arnold took a malicious pleasure in lamenting frequently and ironically his want of what Harrison had rather pretentiously called "a system of philosophy with principles coherent, interdependent, subordinate and derivative."

Arnold's preference for his method of composition, as for his method of thought, though often expressed in bantering mood, represented a deep-seated conviction. In the Preface to his *Essays in Criticism*, he writes:

> It is not in my nature—some of my critics would rather say, not in my power—to dispute on behalf of any opinion, even my own, very obstinately. To try and approach Truth on one side after another, not to persist in pressing forward, on any one side, with violence and self will—it is only thus, it seems to me, that mortals may hope to gain any vision of the mysterious goddess, whom we shall never see, except in outline. He who will do nothing but fight impetuously toward her in his own, one, favorite, particular line is inevitably destined to run his head into the black robe in which she is wrapped.
>
> But the truth is, I have never been able to hit it off happily with the logicians, and it would be mere affectation in me to give myself the airs of doing so. They imagine truth something to be proved, I something to be seen; they something to be manufactured, I something to be found. I have a profound respect for intuitions, and a very lukewarm respect for the elaborate machine-work of my friends the logicians. I have always thought that all which was worth much in this elaborate machine-work of theirs came from an intuition, to which they gave a name of their own. How did they come by this intuition? Ah! if they would tell us that. But no: they set their machine in motion and build up a fine showy edifice, glittering and unsubstantial like a pyramid of eggs; and then they say: "Come and look at our pyramid!" And what does one find in it? Of all that heap of eggs, the one poor little fresh egg, the original intuition, has got hidden away far out of sight and forgotten. And all the other eggs are addled.[30]

[28] *Letters*, I, 282.

[29] "Culture: A Dialogue," in *Choice of Books* (1886).

[30] The second paragraph appears in the 1865 edition; Arnold removed it in later editions.

These intuitions, though non-rational in origin, are not revelations, they do not come to the untrained and unlettered mind. They come from literary tact, the result of wide reading in the best books. This is a favorite doctrine of Arnold's. It is his justification for faith in his own conclusions in religion against those of the theological specialists; for trusting his own taste rather than that of highly specialized Greek scholars in questions relating to the translation of Homer; and for believing that he was really a better politician than contemporary men of affairs. So many passages might be cited that selection is difficult; I quote the conclusion of the introduction to *Literature and Dogma:*

> For the good of letters may be had without skill in arguing, or that formidable logical apparatus, not unlike a guillotine, which Professor Huxley speaks of somewhere as the young man's best companion. . . . But the valuable thing in letters . . . is, as we have often remarked, the judgment which forms itself in a fair mind along with fresh knowledge. . . . For this judgment comes almost of itself; and what it displaces it displaces easily and naturally, and without any turmoil of controversial reasonings. . . . So that minds with small aptitude for abstruse reasoning may yet, through letters, gain some hold on sound judgment and useful knowledge, and may even clear up blunders committed, out of their very excess of talent, by the athletes of logic.

The numerous other references to persuasion in the letters and prose works show how much the subject was in Arnold's mind; their chief addition to the theory is the almost complacent belief in charm, mildness, sweet reasonableness as a method.[31] In January, 1866, he wrote his mother:

> The best of this country is that if you say truth as it ought to be said it is sure with time to take effect.[32]

In citing the example of Jesus to those bitter religious controversialists whose spirit seemed to be devoid of the mildness and sweet reasonableness appropriate to Christian character and Christian rhetoric, Arnold, strangely enough, makes an important exception to his principle of persuasion by charm:

> Now, there can be no doubt whatever, that in his invectives against the Scribes and Pharisees Jesus abandoned the mild, uncontentious, winning, inward mode of working which was his true characteristic, and in which his charm and

[31] Arnold seems to have remained mercifully insensible of how irritating this manner, when combined with condescension, can be. His critics pointed it out to him vigorously and frequently enough, but as he said, one never makes the slightest impression on the mind of an opponent.

[32] *Letters*, I, 447.

power lay; and that there was no chance at all of gaining by such invectives the persons at whom they were launched. . . . What may fairly be said is, that the Pharisees against whom Jesus denounced his woes . . . were the people whom there could be no hope of gaining; and that not *their* conversion but a strong impression on the faithful who read or heard, was the thing aimed at, and very rightly aimed at.[33]

This rhetoric of "a strong impression on the faithful" by a denunciation of opponents was a common phenomenon of democratic life before the time of Paul and Jesus; it will probably continue to flourish with or without the sanction of their example, and it is just what Arnold lacked. Arnold never "spoke out."[34]

Arnold's growing faith in the power of mildness and charm may have been responsible for his surprising docility in attempting to learn the art of public speaking during his American tour,[35] after so many years of scorning the orator. In November, 1883, he wrote his sister from Boston:

I wrote last from New York, before my last lecture. I was badly heard, and many people were much disappointed; but they remained to the end, were perfectly civil and attentive, and applauded me when I had done. It made me doubtful about going on with lecturing, however, as I felt I could not maintain a louder pitch of voice than I did in Chickering Hall. . . . There is a good

[33] *Literature and Dogma* (London, 1873), xvii. In the popular edition of 1886 Arnold deleted this passage.

[34] The irritation at this immoderate moderation of Arnold's is most vigorously expressed in the speech of Arminius von Thunder-ten-dronck, in Harrison's "Culture; a Dialogue." "Here we are in this generation, face to face with the passions of fierce men; parties, races, sects, glare in each others' eyes before they spring; death, sin and cruelty stalk among us, filling their maws with innocence and youth; humanity passes onwards shuddering through the raging crowd of foul and hungry monsters, bearing the destiny of the race like a close-veiled babe in her arms, and over all sits Culture high aloft with pouncet box to spare her senses aught unpleasant, holding no form of creed, but contemplating all with infinite serenity, sweetly chanting snatches from graceful sages and ecstatic monks, crying out the most pretty shame upon the vulgarity, the provinciality, the impropriety of it all." This judgment is echoed in William Watson's lines,

The deep, authentic mountain thrill
Ne'er shook his page!

[35] Arnold's American tour is worth special attention as a rhetorical study. I do not go into it here because a forthcoming research study of it by Mr. Chilson Leonard of Yale is announced in the preface to Howard Foster Lowry's edition of Arnold's letters to Clough (Oxford Press, 1932). E. P. Lawrence has given an interesting account in the *Philological Quarterly*, X (1931) under the title "An Apostle's Progress, Arnold in America."

deal to be learned as to the management of the voice, however, and I have set myself to learn it, though I am old to begin. Last night I gave my New York lecture here. I spoke much better than at New York and shall improve much further, I hope.[36]

A week later he wrote again to Mrs. Forster:

The night before last I dined and slept at Barnum's. He said my lecture was *grand,* and that he was determined to belong to the *remnant;* that term is going the round of the United States, and I understand what Dizzy meant when he said I performed a "great achievement" by launching phrases. My love to William. Tell him it is curious to find how one is driven here to study the "technique" of speaking, and how one finds it may be learnt like other things. I could not make myself heard at first, but I am improving. A Professor Churchill, said to be "the best elocutionist in the United States," came twice from Andover to Boston on purpose to try and be of use to me, because, he said, he had got more pleasure from F. Robertson, Ruskin, and me than from any other men. This will give you a good notion of their kindness.[37]

Three weeks later he was quite sure of himself, and wrote to Charles J. Leaf:

The papers in England seem, by what you say, to have made too much of the failure in audibility at the first lecture; it never really endangered my success, as every one who read the report of the lecture was interested; I had no doubt that I could be heard with a little trouble. The "elocution lessons" were merely that a theological professor here, who is a capital speaker himself, and who is interested in me from my writings, went twice for twenty minutes to the hall with me when it was empty, heard me read, and stopped me when I dropped my voice at the end of sentences, which was the great trouble. I get along all right now, and have never failed *to draw* for a moment.[38]

Other criticisms led Arnold to realize that he had not quite mastered the "technique" of speaking in two twenty-minute sessions. Nearly a year later, some time after he had returned to England, he wrote his sister:

How very right you were about what you called my "too solemn," and poor Mr. Carnegie my "ministerial" manner in speaking. Since I have spoken so much, I perceive that it is my great defect, inasmuch as it strikes every one.

[36] *Letters,* II, 264.

[37] *Letters,* II, 268. This account was confirmed by the *New York Tribune* for November 8, 1883, which says that Arnold's second lecture was plainly heard because of changed elocutionary methods. Quoted by E. P. Lawrence, *op. cit.*

[38] *Letters,* II, 274. A British observer wrote to the *New York Tribune* for January 16, 1884, "Mr. Arnold, piloted by Mr. D'Oyly Carte, and inaudibly lecturing to New York Society, too painfully recalls Sampson grinding corn for the Philistines." Quoted by E. P. Lawrence, *op. cit.*

Harper's Magazine goes so far as to say that just because I am irresistibly agreeable to read, I ought never to speak, because speaking is a line in which I am imperfect. I was talking about this to Huxley, and he said that for years he had made the mere manner of speaking his perpetual study; but then, he said, he regarded speaking as to be his business in life.[39]

But all this willingness to learn the art of public speaking—or in his case, really, public reading—does not mean that he was willing to become a speech-maker in the ordinary sense. On his return from America he was in demand as a speaker, and might have spent his time addressing audiences, but he wrote to Sydney Buxton, M.P.:

I am refusing every invitation to lecture and make addresses this year or I shall never establish my freedom. It is the duty of a public man to appear in public, and he has many compensations; but I am not a public man, and the "saying a few words" which to a public man seems the most natural thing in the world, is to me an artificial and unnatural performance, quite out of my line.[40]

III

In Arnold's own time the irritation caused by his manners and mannerisms, and the hostility of the non-conformist theologians, liberal politicians, and conservatives who feared state action in education, led to the creation of a stereotype of an ineffectual reformer of the "kid-glove persuasion," a characterization about as far from the truth as Arnold's famous phrase on Shelley as the beautiful and ineffectual angel. In our time the criticism of Arnold is conducted by scholars writing for scholars. If we regard him for the time being simply as a rhetorician, and ask who it was that he was trying to persuade, and of what, we shall come to a better understanding of his purposes, the first requisite for intelligent criticism.

When Arnold referred to his efforts with the great English public, he meant ultimately, of course, the whole nation; but his direct influence he knew would be limited to a small portion of it, the saving remnant, the small group of intelligent folk to be found in all three classes, the Barbarians, the Philistines, and the Populace. In discussing political meaures he often talked of the power of the opinion of the quiet folk, who did not rush into public meetings, but whose opinion in the long run carried great weight. An idea of this audience may be gained by reading the articles of contemporary contributors to *Macmillan's*, the *Edinburgh Review*, *Fortnightly*,

[39] *Unpublished Letters of Matthew Arnold* (Ed. by Arnold Whitridge, Yale Press, 1923), p. 53.

[40] *Letters*, II, 424.

Quarterly Review, Nineteenth Century, Cornhill, Contemporary Review, and others. Such essays, I think, represent a higher standard of thought and expression than the magazine articles of today, and largely because they were written for different readers. The subjects that the nineteenth century critics wrote upon are dicussed today in technical journals in technical language. The growing specialization of scholarship with an accompanying growth in the organizations of scholars has produced a large number of small, highly specialized groups of readers very different from the general reader of the nineteenth century. These technical essays are doubtless necessary to the advancement of thought and learning; but writing for such specialized groups has its unfortunate effects upon style and thought. The path from criticism to scholarship to pedantry is short and easy.

The point of this apparent excursus is that it has become difficult for our critics to place Arnold. He was more learned than our journalists, and not so learned as our professors. His style was admirably adapted to a group of readers that seems to have disappeared; his function now seems to be to introduce college freshmen to culture. Even here we edit him carefully. It is well to read *On Translating Homer* edited by a classical scholar and learn that Arnold's theory of the unity of the authorship of Homer is not held by present-day scholars. It is well to be cautioned against rash generalizations in *Celtic Literature* by the learned editor. It would also be well to have it pointed out that Arnold was not writing or speaking as a professor,[41] that these topics in which he was in error were incidental to his main purpose, which was to persuade an audience of the general readers of the nineteenth century of the wisdom of certain general ideas usually relating to conduct. His real subject matter was in the realm of Aristotelian rhetoric, of probability, of ethics and politics, and not in the realm of scholarship. This, of course, does not mean that his errors should be overlooked. He was himself anxious that the knowledge he commended should be the best knowledge. But look for a moment at the rhetorical purposes of the works which chiefly interest scholars today.

On Translating Homer is, I suppose, the most scholarly of his works, the one in which he was most competent to deal with his

[41] We should not be too much influenced by the fact that Arnold delivered lectures as Professor of Poetry at Oxford. He was elected to this chair solely on the basis of his then little read poetry, he did not take seriously the title of Professor or feel that the duty of occasional lectures in the criticism of poetry imposed upon him the responsibilities of specialized scholarship.

subject, and with a theme which was chiefly interesting to scholars. It is the book which usually comes off best when in the hands of critics. It is not surprising, then, that it has the smallest element of rhetorical purpose. And yet there were two rhetorical aims, I believe that animated Arnold in these lectures. They were, first, to show that the critic, by whom he means such generally well-read, sensitive and cultivated persons as himself, is a different and often better judge of poetry than the professional scholar; and, secondly, to exalt the grand style as an instrument in forming character.

Arnold's attacks on scholars are almost as numerous and vigorous as the attacks on rhetoricians. In this middle ground of the critic he again calls to mind Isocrates contending wtih both philosopher and sophist. But it will not do to suggest that the Arnoldian critic is a mere middleman. He has too great a source of authority in his own intuitions for that. He is quite willing to accept the products of the scholars when they serve his purposes, but he is more than willing to point out the limitations of their work. Numerous passages from *On Translating Homer* might be cited to show that scholarship is not enough, that the philological view is likely to be insensitive and uncreative, but I take only the most famous sentences:

> Much as Mr. Newman was mistaken when he talked of my rancour, he is entirely right when he talks of my ignorance. And yet, perverse as it seems to say so, I sometimes find myself wishing, when dealing with matters of poetical criticism, that my ignorance were even greater than it is. To handle these matters properly there is needed a poise so perfect that the least overweight in any direction tends to destroy the balance. Temper destroys it, a crotchet destroys it, even erudition may destroy it. . . . Little as I know, therefore, I am always apprehensive in dealing with poetry, lest even that little should "prove too much for my abilities." [42]

[42] *On Translating Homer*, London, 1896, pp. 116-7. Since this distinction between scholar and critic is so important to Arnold, I will add a passage from the Preface to the 1873 edition of *Literature and Dogma* (later greatly abbreviated by Arnold for the popular edition of 1886). "But perhaps the quality specially needed for drawing the right conclusion from the facts, when one has got them, is best called perception, delicacy of perception. And this no man can have who is a mere specialist, who has not what we call *culture* in addition to the knowledge of his particular study; and many theologians, in Germany as well as elsewhere, are specialists. And even when we have added culture to special knowledge, a good fortune, a natural tact, a perception must go with our culture to make our criticism sure. . . . This, I say, shows how large a thing criticism is; since even of those from whom we must take what we now in theology most want, knowledge of the facts of our study, and to whom we are, therefore, and ought to be under deep obligation, even of them we must

The other great concern of Arnold's, the ethical value of the grand style, is not fully developed here, indeed Arnold nowhere develops it adequately, but it is stated about as fully as Arnold puts it anywhere; its frequent repetition indicates that it was a favorite notion.

> The grand style, which is Homer's, is something more than touching and stirring; it can form the character, it is edifying. The old English Balladist may stir Sir Philip Sidney's heart like a trumpet, and this is much; but Homer, but the few artists in the grand style, can do more; they can refine the raw natural man, they can transmute him. So it is not without cause that I say, and say again, to the translator of Homer: "Never for a moment suffer yourself to forget our fourth fundamental proposition, *Homer is noble.*" [43]

In expressing this distrust of the authority of the scholar, and the belief in the formative power of great poetry, Arnold is not speaking on matters of scholarship at all, and it is an inadequate estimate which overlooks this element of what I have called rhetorical purpose.

The Study of Celtic Literature has suffered most from the critics,[44] and perhaps it is not a coincidence that here the element of rhetorical purpose is much greater. The critics of these lectures do not usually mention the plain and repeated statements in which Arnold says that he is not writing on Celtic literature as a scholar. Any unprejudiced reader of the introduction will agree, I think, that Arnold could not have done more to make his position clear. He submitted his text to the best scholar of the times in the field, and

not take too much, or take anything like all they offer; but we must take much and leave much, and must have experience enough to know what to take and what to leave."

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 62. Other passages on the formative power of noble poetry, especially interesting to teachers of interpretive reading, are cited in Sir Joshua Fitch's *Thomas and Matthew Arnold and their Influence on English Education* (London, 1897), pp. 175-185. See also *Thoughts on Education from Matthew Arnold* (ed. by Leonard Huxley, London, 1912). Consult index under Reading books and culture, and Recitations.

[44] For an attack on Arnold as "the greatest of modern English sophists," with the *Celtic Literature* as the chief illustration, see Lane Cooper's essay "Teacher and Student," in *Two Views of Education* (Yale Press, 1922). Professor Cooper treats Arnold as another professor. Professor Garrod offers this reply to the charge of sophistry: "If I conceive rightly his aim in criticism it was the exact opposite of that of the sophists. For the crime of the sophists was this, that they taught an interested love of knowledge. They taught, not a pure interest in ideas, but a love of ideas essentially related to practice, to politics, to party." *Op. cit.*, p. 74.

printed his comments as footnotes. He nowhere poses as a scholar in Celtic literature. The scholar, of course, will say that if Arnold could not treat his subject as a scholar he should have left it alone. This is, I think, typical of scholastic blindness to rhetorical purpose. Why did Arnold write about Celtic literature when he knew little about it? Simply to plead effectively for more study of Celtic and to rebuke the prejudices of Philistine journalists who were attacking such studies and making themselves and all Englishmen odious in the eyes of the Celts. An editorial in the London *Times* which denounced the Chester Eisteddfod, began, "The Welsh language is the curse of Wales," and ended, "The sooner all Welsh specialties disappear from the face of the earth the better." This gave Arnold the opportunity he so often took of assailing what was unamiable in the English character, of pointing out why they had failed so lamentably in their relations with the Irish and the Welsh. One effective way of rebuking such narrowness was to emphasize the indebtedness of English literature to Celtic elements. In doing this Arnold made some errors which have been fully and fairly dealt with by Mr. Alfred Nutt in his annotated edition of the *Celtic Literature*, but such corrections should not lead us to forget Arnold's main purposes, which are stated many times, and emphasized again in the conclusion.

> At such a moment it needs some moderation not to be attacking Philistinism by storm, but to mine it through such gradual means as the slow approach to culture, and the introduction of chairs of Celtic. . . . Let us reunite ourselves with our better mind and with the world through science; and let it be one of our angelic revenges on the Philistines, who among their other sins are the guilty authors of Fenianism, to found at Oxford a chair of Celtic, and to send, through the gentle ministrations of science, a message of peace to Ireland.[45]

Mr. Nutt's criticisms are searching, and should be read as a protection against Arnold's errors, but his tribute to Arnold's success in achieving his real purposes is not affected by his scholarly criticism.

> Matthew Arnold's Oxford Lectures on the Study of Celtic Literature are a masterpiece of critical insight and suggestive power, but they are far more than this: they inaugurate a new period in the relation between England and Ireland, between Teutonism and Celticism, as animating ethical and æsthetical conceptions, they herald a new attitude of the Celtic peoples toward their national literature; they suggest and adumbrate problems, political, racial, æsthetic upon the solution of which much thought and intellectual labor and self-sacrific-

[45] *The Study of Celtic Literature* (ed. by Alfred Nutt, London, 1910), p. 150.

ing zeal have been expended in the last forty years; they are still, in a most effective sense, a quickening ferment in the Neo-Celtic Revival.[46]

At the particular time and in the circumstances Arnold's lectures did more for the study of Celtic literature than any technical treatment could have done; scholars then had little reliable knowledge; Arnold made no false pretensions; the results, I think, justified him in the pleasure with which he wrote his mother:

> The Celtic papers are producing an effect far beyond what I had ventured to hope. This is a great pleasure to me, and a proof how much there is in the way of presenting a subject, for certainly a more hopeless subject in itself to approach the British public with one could hardly imagine.[47]

Not all the *Essays in Criticism* are concerned with literature, and it can hardly be claimed that those studies in which Arnold is, as Professor Saintsbury says, sticking to his own field, have less of rhetorical purpose than the political, theological, and social criticism, nor do they differ essentially in method. Arnold apparently had two audiences in view in these essays, neither of them composed of scholars. First, there were the possible writers of the future, who were to be persuaded that the present low estate of English literature, its inferiority to contemporary French and German work, was due to its lack of ideas, and its lack of restraint. Here we have one of the many cases in which the falsity of Arnold's premises seem to do so little damage to his conclusions. English literature at the time was not in a low estate, and it was not inferior to the French or German, but more ideas and more restraint are usually needed by young writers, and this advice, apparently, is safe from the slings and arrows of outraged scholarship.

The other audience, that of the general readers, was largely instructed in the sources of virtuous conduct. The ethical bias of Arnold's criticism has been dealt with by so many writers that it need not be discussed at length here. Byron shows us the value of sincerity and strength, Wordsworth the joy in common things. Shelley's life offers the critic the opportunity to mark the odious and yet preserve the beautiful, and Tolstoy gives us "sound and saving doctrine." Amiel's Journal is instructive as a warning against the pathological, and an example of the need of a writer or a doer of any task to limit himself. As Arnold knows that "a merely sensuous man cannot either by promise or performance be a very great poet," he

[46] *Ibid.*, p. v.
[47] *Letters*, I, 382.

goes through Keats's letters looking "for signs of character and virtue." Gray wrote good letters of consolation and had seriousness, character. Milton is good for us. He counter-acts the Anglo-Saxon and particularly American glorification of commonness. His great style refines and elevates us, even if we cannot explain how, and he gives us the inspiring example of a man who worked hard to keep himself worthy of the grandeur of his vocation. Heine, with all the culture of Germany, and all the ideas of modern Europe, only gave us a half result, for want of moral balance, and of nobleness of soul and character. Goethe was for Arnold, as for Carlyle, not so much an artist as "a strong tower into which the doubter and despairer might run and be safe."

I do not offer these judgments as a complete or even thoroughly representative summary of Arnold's literary verdicts; I merely emphasize the hortatory, rhetorical character of the essays in which, if anywhere, Arnold is writing within the field of his special knowledge. It was Arnold's rôle to appear to be a moralist among æsthetes and an æsthete among moralists. His devotion to truth was, in spite of all his praises of disinterestedness, as pragmatic as that of most reformers. The truth he spoke at any particular time was always colored by the need of his audience. The English should be told the French were superior because French qualities ought to be cultivated by Englishmen. The Italians should not be told of French superiority because the Italians were too much like the French already. Whether Hebraism or Hellenism was to be prescribed depended entirely upon the ills of the audience. Viewing culture as harmonious development, as the pursuit of perfection, truth was merely the emphasis of the particular defect which most stood in the way of perfection at the moment. "This is the truth for you, now," he would say. Arnold never admitted the right of a people to the defects of their qualities, and in his counsels of perfection he never hesitated to urge a union of incompatibles. Such a critic will be always and everywhere a rhetorician. If he is free from self-seeking, refuses to become tied to organizations, and preserves his free play of ideas, he may be fortunate enough to be absolved from sophistry, but he belongs to the company of the rhetoricians, wether he call himself philosopher or critic.

Arnold's literary criticism, then, is as rhetorical as his political and social writing. And the examination of his political and social criticism (which has to be omitted here, for lack of space) shows it to be essentially literary in quality. This fact, I think, shows the

looseness with which the term "literary criticism" is used. I shall not attempt to define it or even to enumerate all the various meanings, but I want to distinguish the Arnoldian conception of it as set forth in "The Function of Criticism," and modified by a study of his practice, from a usage which is perhaps more current now. We ordinarily think of literary criticism as the criticism of literature, that is, the term takes its meaning from its subject matter. We may be illiterates writing a jargon of pseudo-science, but if we are talking about literature, it passes as literary criticism, no matter how unliterary in tone and method. In so far as this criticism rests upon organized principles of recognized validity taken from a special field of thought, and reaching conclusions within that field, it does not come within the province of rhetoric, if we take rhetoric in its Aristotelian sense of the faculty of persuasion in the field of probability. Of course the battle over the existence of any organized principles of literary criticism with recognized validity is an eternal one, and it is probable that criticism at its most intellectual and scientific level has a considerable element of rhetoric in it. But when we look at the Arnoldian conception, we see how nearly identical it is with the Aristotelian rhetoric. Literary criticism is not necessarily criticism of literature at all. It may be the criticism of anything if it has a literary flavor. To be more exact, it is criticism of all branches of knowledge—theology, philosophy, history, art, science, to use Arnold's list—if the tone and temper and method, and oftentimes the scale of values, are taken from literature. That is, literary criticism takes its meaning from its method and tone, not its subject matter.

Most of the writing and speaking which Arnold condemned as rhetoric was lacking in the tone and temper of literature, but by this Arnold did not mean chiefly that it was not "elegant" or "literary," he meant that it lacked the tolerance and detachment and wisdom that come from a wide acquaintance with the best that has been said and thought. Disinterestedness for Arnold was not what we understand by scientific or even æsthetic detachment. Neither of these varieties is compatible with Arnold's emphasis upon persuasion. We often say, indeed, that detachment and persuasion are antithetical. Arnold's earnest, disinterested persuasion was for him criticism. I think we may also call it one of the branches of Aristotelian rhetoric.

This does not mean that Arnold's attack upon the rhetoricians was not valid, or that we should be blind to the differences between the noble and ignoble rhetoric. Such attacks as Arnold's looking backward to Plato, and forward to Mencken or Sinclair Lewis, or prac-

tically any social critic of the moment, are of the permanent stuff of the criticism of life, even if not subject to the laws of poetic truth and beauty. The struggle with such rhetoric is perpetual. On the other hand, criticism which is vital, which is vital as Arnold's was and is, will always have a large element of noble rhetoric in it, and rhetorical analysis will be useful in understanding it. We may agree with Max Eastman in his attack upon the literary mind so far as to admit the need of more science in the training of the critic, and we may sympathize with his irritation at the lofty, anti-scientific attitude of "literary gentlemen"; but to say that the judgment based upon Arnold's culture is merely loose talk, that psychology and sociology are about to take all the old questions of criticism out of the realm of probability and put them in the realm of science, is as loose talk as the most literary of literary critics can indulge in. The taste and judgment which are the products of our culture will differ from Arnold's taste and judgment. And the verdicts of our judgment will always be undergoing modifications at the hands of science and the taste of future generations. The critics of the future will doubtless have more humility forced on them than Arnold possessed. But the intuitions of a disciplined spirit and the persuasion of an accomplished rhetorician will always have their place in criticism.

A GUIDE TO THE LITERATURE ON SPEECH EDUCATION[1]

ABRAHAM TAUBER
College of the City of New York

Introductory Note

THOUGH speech education (as rhetoric) has a venerable genealogy in the history of education, it suffered a serious decline in prestige and was for many years left outside the pale of "respectable" work in English. Only in recent years has it been taken back into the fold of the modern curriculum. Its growth of late, however, has been

[1] One of a series of guides to the professional literature of various phases of education, initiated by Carter Alexander, Library Professor, Teachers College, Columbia University, and worked up by students in his courses. The effort is made to publish each guide in a periodical of special interest in its field. Information on the guides completed, under way, and contemplated, with places of publication, may be obtained from Professor Alexander.

phenomenal, as the perfect labyrinth of printed matter in the field shows.

The need for a Guide has been recognized, and committees have been appointed by the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH.[2]

The problem is increased in difficult by the complex nature of this field of study, which embraces such divergent activities as Drama, Debating, Public Speaking, Speech Correction, etc. Hence, contributions to it come from a bewildering variety of sources.

The need is for a brief, but comprehensive guide, which will open the problem to further elaboration. This guide is the author's attempt to meet this need.

The headings under which materials can be located are seemingly inexhaustible. However, with the following leads, almost all important sources can be located. (See also section on *Indexes.*)

TABLE 1
Subject Headings Under Which to Look for Materials on Speech Education

Subject Headings	Library Card Catalog at Teachers College	Education Index	International Index
Audience		x	
Communication		x	x
Composition	x	x	
Conversation	x	x	x
Deaf	x	x	x
Debate	x	x	
Dictionary	x	x	x
Drama	x	x	x
English	x	x	x
English Language	x	x	x
Expression	x		
Hearing	x	x	x
Language	x	x	x
Oral Composition	x	x	
Oral English	x	x	
Oratory	x	x	x
Phonetics	x	x	x
Public Speaking	x	x	x
Reading (oral)	x	x	
Speech	x	x	x
Speech Defects	x	x	x
Stammering	x		x
Theater	x	x	x
Voice	x	x	x

[2] Heffner, Hubert C. Letter to Editor—"A Speech Bibliography." Q.J.S. 17:259-61, April, 1931.
——"Committee on Bibliography.—Report." Q.J.S. 19:132-36, February, 1933.
——"Report of Committee on Bibliography." Q.J.S., 20:160-61, February, 1934.

Abstracts

The best single source for abstracts is the *Quarterly Journal of Speech* (see *Periodicals*). In addition to this, the cumulative publications of the Modern Language Association (see *Associations*) as well as the volumes by Coleman and Fife (see *Bibliographies—Research*) are invaluable.

The thesis abstracts published by the various universities usually list this field under "Speech." For tracing these, see Derring, C. E. "Lists and Abstracts of Masters' Theses and Doctors' Dissertations in Education." *Teachers College Record* 34:490-502, March, 1933.

Valuable material of an experimental or research nature is often reported in the following:

Child Development Abstracts, issued bimonthly, gives a digest of material, listed alphabetically by author under subject headings like "Personality," "Mental Hygiene and Psychiatry," "Special Abilities and Disabilities," etc. Includes a subject index in each number. Also includes subject and author indexes in the annual volume.

Psychological Abstracts, issued monthly, gives a digest of material, listed alphabetically by author under general headings like "General," "Sensation and Perception," "Nervous and Mental Disorders," "Social Functions of the Individual." Indexed by author and subject (like Speech, Larynx, etc.). Indexed only in annual volume.

Social Science Abstracts, issued monthly, gives a digest of material listed alphabetically by author under subject headings like "Social Institutions," "Cultural Anthropology," "Social Pathology," "Human Nature," etc. Includes subject and author indexes only in annual volumes. This discontinued as a separate publication in December of 1932, but a similar service began immediately in the *Journal of Sociology*.

Associations

A. Nationally Prominent

National Association of Teachers of Speech (organized 1915 as National Association of Public Speaking Teachers). The professional organization in the field. Meets annually, last three days in December. Publishes *Quarterly Journal of Speech* (see *Periodicals*).

National Council of Teachers of English. Meets annually in convention; reports of research often interesting to people in Speech Education. Publishes *English Journal* (see *Periodicals*).

Modern Language Association of America. (*PMLA*—Publications of the Modern Language Association.) Often has speakers, meetings, and publications of interest to people in the field of Speech. Meets annually.

B. More Limited in Scope

Central States Speech Association

Eastern Public Speaking Conference

Southern Association

Western Association of Teachers of Speech

All of these are affiliated with the National Association of Teachers of Speech (above), from which information about officers, meetings, etc., can be obtained.

New York Association of High School Teachers of Speech, Board of Education, New York. Meets occasionally to discuss common problems. Has functioning committees on research and bibliography. (See *Bibliography—High School.*)

C. SPECIALIZED

1. *Oral Interpretation* (See *Bibliographies—Oral Interpretations.*)

Society for the Study of Expression. Conducts meetings, discussions, devoted to problems in this field.

2. *Phonetics and Philology* (See *Bibliographies—Phonetics and Philology;* also *Bibliographies—Research—Phonetics.*)

International Phonetic Association.

National Association for American Speech.

American Dialect Society. Publishes *Dialect Notes.* (See *Periodicals.*)

3. *Speech Correction* (See *Bibliographies—Research—Speech Correction.*)

American Society for the Study of Disorders of Speech. Meets annually, publishes, and does cooperative research in the field.

Speech Improvement Division, Board of Education, New York City. Letitia Raubichek, Director. Conducts meetings, discussing questions of interest to people in Speech Correction work.

National Society for the Study and Correction of Speech Disorders.

4. *Deaf and Hard of Hearing* (See *Bibliographies—Research—Deaf and Hard of Hearing.*)

New York League for the Hard of Hearing, 480 Lexington Avenue, New York City. Headquarters for information about all aspects of this work.

5. *Theaters*

National Theater Conference. Usually meets in conjunction with National Association of Teachers of Speech, from which information can be secured.

D. PROFESSIONAL HONOR SOCIETIES

Cable, W. Arthur. *A Program of Speech Education in a Democracy.* Expression Co., Boston, Mass., 1932, 595 p.

P. 554—List of National Fraternities, Sororities in the Field of Speech Education.

P. 565-80—Membership, by institution, in national fraternities in Speech Education.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

The material here is classified by the various fields in Speech Education.

A. GENERAL

1. *Most Complete Bibliography*

Meader, Emma G. *Teaching Speech in the Elementary School.* Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 317. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928. 129 p.

Bibliography on pp. 119-26 following study. Includes periodicals, books in Psychology and Physiology of Speech, History of Speech, Voice in Speech and Song, Sounds of Speech, Speech Improvement and Correction, Methods in Teaching Speech, Speech Tests.

2. *Best Brief Bibliography* (Valuable for Students)

Davis, E. H. and Mammen, E. W. *The Spoken Word in Life and Art.* Prentice-Hall, 1932. 512 p.

Selected bibliography at the end of the various sections in the text, on Voice Training, Phonetics, Conveyance of Thought, Emotional Expression, etc.

3. *Annual*

Serjeantson, Mary S. *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature for 1931.* Edited for the Modern Humanities Research Association, 1931. Bowes and Bowes, Cambridge, Mass., 1932. 272 p.

(Includes *Quarterly Journal of Speech.* See *Periodicals.*) This English work is unusually complete and worthwhile, though unannotated. It is the latest in a series of which the earliest work was published in 1925.

The language section is arranged according to subject headings like the following:

English Language—P. 21-40
V. General
VI. Vocabulary
VII. History of English and Grammar
VIII. Subsidiary Forms of English

Includes subheads: Dictionaries, Voice Study, Name Study, Semantics, Idioms, Grammar, Orthography, Phonology (Phonetics), Inflection and Word Formation, Syntax, English Dialects, Vulgar English, Slang, Cant, American English (including Slang).

(See volumes by Coleman and Fife in *Bibliographies—Research.*)

4. *Older—Cumulative*

Northrup, Clark. *A Register of Bibliographies of the English Language and Literature.* Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1925. 507 p. (By grant of Heckscher Foundation for Advancement of Research.)

Unannotated work, complete up to 1925.

Kennedy, A. G. *A Bibliography of Writings on the English Language.* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1927. 517 p.

Includes 13,000 unannotated references, up to 1922.

(See volumes by Coleman and Fife in *Bibliographies—Research.*)

B. DEBATE

McKean, Dayton D. "A Bibliography of Debating." *Q. J. S.* 19:206–12, April, 1933.

An unannotated bibliography of books on debating, appended to an article discussing the work of the Committee on Bibliography of the National Association of Teachers of Speech.

"Debate" Issue. *Speech Bulletin,* Vol. 2, No. 2, December, 1930.

C. DRAMATICS

1. *Complete*

Baker, Blanch M. *Dramatic Bibliography; An Annotated List of Books on the History and Criticism of the Drama and Stage and on the Allied Arts of the Theatre.* H. W. Wilson Company, 1933. 320 p.

Complete, annotated, accurate source to all matters pertinent to the theatre. Lists books in "Acting and Speech Arts." Includes Bibliography of Bibliographies.

2. *Periodical Issues*

"Creative Experiments through Drama." *Progressive Education*, Vol. 12, No. 1, January, 1931.

Discussions in the use of Drama in Progressive Education.

"Drama" Issue. *Speech Bulletin*, Vol. 2, No. 2, May, 1931. (See *Periodicals.*)

Devoted to bibliography and discussion in the field of teaching Dramatics.

D. Educational Levels

1. *Elementary*

Poole, Irene. "Reference Bibliography for Teachers of Speech in the Elementary Schools." *Speech Bulletin* 3:29–39, May, 1932.

A well annotated bibliography of books of interest to teachers on this level.

2. *Secondary*

Report of Book Committee of New York Association of High School Teachers of Speech. Mimeographed sheets, 10c. Miss Elizabeth MacNamara, Erasmus Hall High School, Flatbush Avenue, Brooklyn.

Lists recommended texts and reference works of interest to teachers on this level.

3. *College and University*

Good, Carter V. *Teaching in College and University.* Warwick and York, 1929. 557 p.

Appendix contains section of 300 references, partly annotated, to materials in Teaching of Speech (and English) on this level.

E. Oral Interpretation (See *Associations—Specialized*)

Farma, William J. *Prose, Poetry, and Drama for Oral Interpretation.* Harper, 1930. 527 p.

P. 525–27 contain an annotated list of books in this field.

F. Phonetics and Philology (See *Bibliographies—Research—Phonetics*)

1. *History of Language*

Krapp, G. P. *The English Language in America*, Vol. II, p. 273–84. Century, 1925. 2 volumes.

Bibliography of references in this field.

2. *Philosophy of Language*

Mandell, Sibyl. "Relation of Language to Thought." *Q.J.S.* 17:522–31, November, 1931.

Bibliography of 45 references used in the article, appended as a series of footnotes.

Gray, Giles Wilkinson. "Sidelights on the Pronunciation of English." *Q.J.S.* 18:546–60, November, 1932.

Annotated list of 28 items in this field.

G. PUBLIC SPEAKING

Sandford, W. P., and Yeager, W. H. "Bibliography of Public Speaking." *Successful Speaking*, p. 209–10. Thos. Nelson and Sons, 1927.

An unannotated list of recent books in the field.

"Contest" Issue. *Speech Bulletin*, Vol. 3, No. 1, December, 1931.

Devoted to bibliography and discussions of matters pertinent to this subject.

H. RESEARCH (See *Research Agencies*)

1. *General*

a. *Complete—Yearly. 1926 to date.*

1926–27—Office of Education Bulletin, 1928, No. 22.
1927–28—Office of Education Bulletin, 1929, No. 36.
1928–29—Office of Education Bulletin, 1930, No. 23.

Listed under subjects (below) and by author. Include title, institution, date, pages, and occasional abstract of thesis.

1929–30—Office of Education Bulletin, 1931, No. 13.
English Language, p. 85–99, 300 items.
Dramatics and Elocution, p. 186–88, 19 items.
1930–31—Office of Education Bulletin, 1932, No. 16.
English Language, p. 85–101, 200 items.
Dramatics and Elocution, p. 161–62, 30 items.
1931–32—Office of Education Bulletin, 1933, No. 6.
English Language, p. 53–8, 129 items.
Dramatics and Elocution, p. 94–6, 24 items.

b. *Older Research*

Theses in Education in the United States, 1917–1919, published by the University of Illinois, Bureau of Educational Research, in 1920, was the first of a series of volumes conveying the research reported in masters' and doctoral dissertations in education in this country. Unfortunately, no subject index is included. The Table of Contents includes, as heading VII, "Special Subjects of the Curriculum," in which are included early studies in Speech and English.

Monroe, W. S., et al. *Ten Years of Educational Research, 1918–1927*. Bulletin No. 42, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., 1928. 349 p. Supplement, Bulletin No. 50, 1930.

The format lists all the significant research reports published during the indicated period, which the latter supplements. Both are well indexed, including Speech and Speech Pathology as headings. Work is also indexed alphabetically by author.

Extending back to 1912 is the series of volumes issued by the Library of Congress, *American Doctoral Dissertations*. This is well indexed by author, institution, and subject, as well as by date of research.

2. *Language*

a. *Complete*

Fife, R. H. *A Summary of Reports on the Modern Foreign Languages: with an Index to the Reports*. Macmillan, 1931. 261 p.

Discussion of the 17 volumes in this series, summarizing the investigations to date. Includes Methods of Teaching, the Testing Movement, Bibliographic Work, Objectives, Training of Teachers, Curriculum.

Coleman, Algernon. *An Analytical Bibliography of Modern Language Teaching.* University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1933. 296 p.

Contains annotations and digests of material in this field for years 1927–1932. Some topics considered are General Language, p. 543–46; Training of Modern Language Teachers, p. 500–9; Oral and Aural Tests, p. 415–21; Specific Methodological Suggestions, p. 360–88; Vocabulary and Idioms, p. 222–65; Phonetics and Pronunciation, p. 115–37.

b. *Specialized*

(1) *Grammar and Composition*

Lyman, R. L. *Summary of Investigations Relating to Grammar, Language, and Composition.* Supplementary Educational Monographs No. 36, School of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., 1929. 302 p.

Supplements—*Elementary School Journal* (including January, 1929—January, 1931):

1. Vol. 32:266–75, December, 1931.
2. Vol. 32:352–63, January, 1932.
3. Vol. 32:426–34, February, 1932.
4. Vol. 34:134–37, October, 1933.

Includes annotated bibliographies of all references in this field.

Investigations in such subjects as Correct Usage, Mechanics of Speaking and Writing, Oral English, including Curriculum, Methods of Teaching, etc.

Smith, Dora V. "Report of the Committee on the Evolution of Textbooks in Composition." *Elementary English Reviews* 10:151, 154, 160, June, 1933.

A bibliography of investigations in the Teaching of English Grammar and Composition is appended to this article.

Greene, Harry A. "Research in Elementary Language," *Elementary English Review* 10:101–7, April, 1933.

P. 130–33 list research topics being pursued as M.A. and Ph.D. theses at University of Iowa. Some headings are: "Analysis of Oral Language Activities," "Relation of Oral and Written Activities."

(2) *Psychology*

Powers, Francis F. "Psychology of Language Learning." *Psychological Bulletin*, 26:261–74, May, 1929.[3]

Adams, Sidney and Powers, F. F. "The Psychology of Language." *Psychological Bulletin* 26:241–60, May, 1929.[3]

Urban, Wilbert M. "The Philosophy of Language." *Psychological Bulletin* 26:324–34, May, 1929.[3]

[3] Contains a summary of the recent investigations in the field, in which reference is made by number to the appended bibliography.

(3) *Allied Fields*

Gray, W. S. *Summary of Investigations Relating to Reading.* University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., 1925. 265 p.

Supplements:

Dates Covered	*Periodical*	*Vol.*	*Dates*	*Pages*
July 1, 1927–June 30, 1928	Elementary School Journal	29	Feb., 1929	443–457
			Mar., 1929	496–509
July 1, 1928–June 30, 1929	"	30	Feb., 1930	450–466
			Mar., 1930	496–508
July 1, 1929–June 30, 1930	"	31	Mar., 1931	531–546
			Apr., 1931	
July 1, 1930–June 30, 1931	"	32	Feb., 1932	447–463
			Mar., 1932	510–520
			Apr., 1932	587–594
July 1, 1931–June 30, 1932	Journal of Educational Research	26	Feb., 1933	401–424
July 1, 1932–June 30, 1933	Elementary School Journal	34	Oct., 1933	130–134

These include a bibliography, complete annotation, and summary of all the investigations in this field. The Oral Reading section is of course pertinent, while many of the silent reading studies—like interests in poetry, eye-movements of stutterers, etc., are valuable for teachers of Speech.

Baugh, A. C. *American Bibliography for 1932.* Publications of the Modern Language Association 47: Supplement 1212–14, 1932.

Paine, G. *American Bibliography for 1932.* Publications of the Modern Language Association 47: Supplement 1252–53, 1932.

These two volumes include unannotated references to the work in the modern language field covering the dates indicated.

3. *Phonetics* (See *Bibliographies—Phonetics and Philology*; also *Associations—Specialized*)

Metfessel, Milton. "Experimental Phonetics." *Psychological Bulletin* 26:305–23, May, 1929.[4]

4. *Speech Correction* (See *Associations—Specialized*)

Travis, Lee Edward. "Recent Research in Speech Pathology." *Psychological Bulletin* 26:275–30, May, 1929.[4]

5. *Deaf and Hard of Hearing* (See *Associations—Specialized*)

Ruckmick, Christian A. "Recent Research in the Field of Audition." *Psychological Bulletin* 27:271–97, April, 1930.[4]

[4] Contains a summary of the recent investigations in the field, in which reference is made by number to the appended bibliography.

I. Speech Correction (See *Associations—Specialized*; also *Bibliographies—Research—Speech Correction*)

1. *Most Complete Bibliography*

Martens, Elise H. *An Annotated Bibliography on the Education and Psychology of Exceptional Children.* Office of Education, Pamphlet No. 23, July, 1931. 48 p.

Includes books, bulletins, periodicals—all well annotated in the fields of Deaf and Hard of Hearing, p. 20–23, and Speech Defectives, p. 32–35. Best single bibliography available in this field.

2. *Deaf and Hard of Hearing*

Leigh, Charles W. E. *Catalogue of the Library for Deaf Education.* Series CCIX—Bibliography No. 11. Manchester University Press, 1932. 143 p.

Contains an unannotated list of all the books catalogued at this library, indexed by author and subject, e.g., Aphasia, Aphonia, Education of the Deaf, Physiology, etc.

New York League for Hard of Hearing. 480 Lexington Avenue, New York City.

Mimeographed bibliographic material, unannotated, but complete and practical.

Book Reviews

The following periodicals (see *Periodicals*) have each a department devoted to the review of books in the field, by authoritative persons. By supplementing each other, they cover the field quite adequately.

The Quarterly Journal of Speech is most important, covering all aspects of Speech Education.

The English Journal stresses teaching of Appreciation of Poetry, Vocabulary Instruction, etc.

American Speech is concerned mostly with the history and development of the language.

The Education Index may be used to locate reviews of particular works, since it lists references under the heading "Book Reviews" and arranges them alphabetically by author.

The Book Review Digest presents concise reviews. It indexes by author, title of book, as well as by subject, e.g., Theatre, Stammering.

To find whether or not a book is in print, consult the *United States Catalogue* (for books in print) 1928, which lists them by author, title, and subject. Some subjects of interest in this field are: Aphasia, Conversation, Deaf and Dumb, Expression, Language and Languages, Lip Reading, Phonetics, Stammering, Voice.

This work is continued in the *Cumulative Book Index*, which carries on from 1928 to date.

Curriculum

A. Recent—Most Valuable

Smith, Dora V. *Instruction in English.* (See *Surveys*)

Indispensable for adequate curriculum set up, especially Chapter II—"Administrative Set-Up for Curriculum Making in English."

Lyman, Rollo L. *The Enrichment of the English Curriculum.* University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1932. 251 p.

Author's ideas concerning the desirable changes and innovations to be introduced in order to "broaden the scope of English instruction." Includes bibliography.

B. Older—Still Valuable

Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools. (See *Surveys*)

P. 85-94. Report of the Committee on Oral English, regarding desirable changes in the curriculum, and reforms in administration.

The Teaching of English in England. (See *Surveys*)

Considers Time to Be Allotted; Types of Speech Training for Each Level; Place of Oral Expression and Reading Aloud in the Curriculum; How Much Phonetics and Oral Tests Ought to Be Included in the Training of Teachers; Desirable Types of Research; Drama as an Educational Activity; Adult Education.

C. Educational Levels

1. *Elementary*

Meader, Emma G. *Teaching Speech in the Elementary School.* (See *Surveys*)

2. *Secondary*

Drummond, A. M. *A Course of Study in Speech Training and Public Speaking for the Secondary School.* Century Company, 1925. 291 p.

The report of a committee appointed by the National Association of Teachers of Speech is presented, along with a series of special articles enunciating principles of curriculum construction and methodology in the various fields of Speech Education.

3. *College and University*

Weaver, J. Clark. "A Survey of Speech Curricula." *Q.J.S.* 18:607-12, November, 1932.

A survey of the speech curricula of the colleges and universities of this country, including a table showing the degrees and type of work offered.

Voelker, C. H. *A Survey of Speech Correction in Colleges and Universities.* (See *Surveys—Speech Correction—College and University Study*)

D. Additional Sources

"Course of Study" Issue. *Speech Bulletin* Vol. 3, No. 2, May, 1932.

Articles and editorial opinion on many phases of this subject.

Cable, W. Arthur. *A Program of Speech Education in a Democracy.* Expression Co., Boston, Mass., 1932. 595 p.

A symposium of articles and speeches in the major considerations and problems of Speech education, i.e., Administration, Professional Attitudes, Public Speaking, Speech Correction, Dramatics, Debating.

History

The best indication of the development of significant changes in trends and tendencies would be to compare the recommendations of the committees in Dora V. Smith's report (1933) with those of the Committee in England (1921) and the National Committee on English (1917). (For all these see *Surveys*).

Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools. (See *Surveys*)

This includes as Chapter II, "History of the Study of English in American Secondary Schools," p. 11-17, a good short summary of the high spots in the development.

Baldwin, C. S. *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic.* 261 p.

——— *Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic.* 321 p.

Macmillan Company, 1924.

History and summary of leading works in field of literature of teaching of Speech, including classics like Aristotle and Cicero. Critical appraisal and digests of each of most important works.

INDEXES

Dramatic Index. 1909 to date. F. W. Faxon Company, 83 Francis Street, Boston, Mass.

Indexes plays, movies, and the publications, *Theatre Arts Monthly, Bookman, Theatre, The Drama,* and *The Quarterly Journal of Speech.* Also indexes many articles on the theatre, from a long list of periodicals unindexed elsewhere. Good source for specialists in the Drama.

Education Index, 1929 to date.

Probably the most valuable for the teacher of Speech, having the most intensive indexing, especially under the heading of Speech Education, including Aims and Objectives, Bibliography, Courses of Study, Creative Activity, Dialect, Research, Teaching, etc.

International Index.

Indexes some publications not covered by *Education Index,* like Publications of the Modern Language Association (see *Associations*) and American Speech (see *Periodicals*). Good to supplement more inclusive *Education Index.*

Loyola Educational Index (1929)

For one year, began what the *Education Index* carries on.

Reader's Guide.

Indexes periodicals of a popular nature not covered by any of above.

Speech Department Office. Room 225, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Includes bibliographies listed under:

Science of Speech
Speech
Speech Activities
Voice Production
Phonetics
Speech Correction
Exercises (Therapy, etc.)

Teachers College, Columbia University Library Card Catalog.

Covers books and publications in Speech Education under headings indicated in Table 1.

NEWS NOTES

(For bibliographical data on all these magazines, see section on *Periodicals.*)

The Quarterly Journal of Speech.

Most complete news of conventions, appointments, publications, etc., in the field, appear in this magazine.

The English Journal.

Includes announcements frequently of interest to teachers of Speech.

Good Speech.

Includes information regarding activities in Great Britain.

The Spoken Word.

Contains notes of meetings, activities in New York metropolitan area.

PERIODICALS

A. *General*

1. *Indispensable*

The Quarterly Journal of Speech. Published by the National Association of Speech, February, April, June, November. (Publication began in 1915.) Editor: Hoyt H. Hudson, Princeton University.

The professional organ in the field. Contains articles, abstracts, reviews, current notes. Listed in: *Loyola Index* (1928), *Education Index* (1929 to date), and *Dramatic Index.*

The Speech Bulletin. Supplement to the *Quarterly Journal of Speech.* Official publication of the Committee for the Advancement of Speech Training in Secondary Schools. Issued periodically in issues devoted to specific fields.

The English Journal. 211 West 68 Street, Chicago, Ill. The Official Organ of the National Council of Teachers of English. Monthly from September to June. (Publication began in 1912.)

Contains articles, news, notes, book reviews, and editorial comment in the field of teaching English, publishes high school and college numbers. Indexed in *Education Index.*

2. *Valuable*

Elementary English Review. 6505 Grand River Avenue, Detroit, Mich. The Official Organ of the National Council of Teachers of English. Monthly from September to June.

Articles on elementary level, speech issues and articles, editorials, news and notes. Indexed in *Education Index.*

The Spoken Word. Official Organ of the Good Speech Society of New York, 500 Park Avenue. Published three times a year. (Publication began in 1933.)

Contains articles, book reviews, plays reviews, discussions of current event of interest to people in any field of Speech.

B. SPECIALIZED FIELDS

1. *Dramatics*

Theatre Arts Monthly. 119 W. 57 Street, New York City. (Publication began in 1917.)

Articles, reviews, illustrations of material of interest concerning the happenings in the current theatre.

The Stage. Published by Theatre Guild, New York.

Same material as above.

Good Speech. Formerly *The Speaking of Poetry*, No. 21, October, 1933. 56 Gordon Square, London, England. Quarterly Review of the Verse Speaking Fellowship, appearing in January, April, July, and October.

Its purpose is the improvement of speech in all parts of society. "Special interest in Choral Speaking—records experiments and gives information regarding all kinds of Speech work." Easy, nontechnical reading for the layman.

2. *Modern Language Study* (Material in this field is frequently relevant to problems of Speech students.)

PMLA. Published quarterly by Modern Language Association of America, 100 Washington Square East, New York City. (Publication began 1886.)

Includes articles and notes of occasional interest, especially in Research and Bibliography.

Modern Language Forum. Published by Modern Language Association of Southern California, Room 407, 1240 South Main Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (Publication began in 1916.)

Articles, reviews, news, etc.

Modern Languages. A Review of Foreign Letters, Science and the Arts. 4 Plowden Building, Temple, E.C., 4, England. University of London Press, Ltd., 10-11 Warwick Lane, London, E.C.H., England. February, April, June, October, December. (Publication began 1919.)

Modern Language Journal. Published by National Federation of Modern Language Teachers. (Publication began 1916.) Editor: Charles H. Holzworth.

Articles, reviews, digests.

3. *Phonetics and Philology* (See *Bibliographies—Phonetics and Philology*; also *Associations—Specialized*)

American Speech. A Quarterly of Linguistic Usage. Columbia University Press, New York City. (Publication began in 1926.)

Scholarly periodical devoted to articles, reviews of books, containing a phonetics department and articles on philology and pronunciation.

Dialect Notes. Publication of the American Dialect Society. (Publication began 1928.) Editor: Miles L. Hanley, Warren House, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Contains articles and information for students in this field.

Word Study. G. and C. Merrian Company, Springfield, Mass. Published occasionally. (Publication began 1925.)

Pamphlet issued gratis to teachers. Back numbers may be obtained. Discussion, letters, excerpts from articles of interest to teachers of Speech.

Le Maître Phonétique. Published by the International Phonetics Association. (Founded 1886.)

Articles in phonetic script, transcribed from all languages (English, French, German, Italian, etc.).

4. *Speech Correction*

The Laryngoscope. An International Monthly Journal Devoted to Discussion of the Ear, Nose and Throat. Laryngoscope Company, 912 So. Kingshighway, St. Louis, Mo. (Publication began 1891.)

Articles and notes in this field, with technical or medical background required.

Often Useful in Speech Correction. (These periodicals often contain items of interest to teachers interested in Speech Correction. See *Abstracts.*)

American Journal of Psychology
American Journal of Sociology
Journal of Experimental Psychology
Psychological Bulletin

5. *Deaf and Hard of Hearing* (See *Associations—Specialized;* also *Bibliographies—Research—Deaf and Hard of Hearing*)

Volta Review. American Association to Promote the Teaching of Speech to the Deaf, 1537—35th St., N.W., Washington, D. C. (Publication began 1899.)

Articles, reports of interest to teachers in this field.

American Annals of the Deaf. Organ of the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf and the Convention of American Instruction of the Deaf. 450 Ahnaip Street, Menasha, Wis. Bimonthly, September to June. (Publication began 1856.)

Research Agencies

National Association of Teachers of Speech. (See *Associations.*)

Conventions devoted to reports of experimental and research activities in the field of Speech education. Has appointed committees on bibliographic and research problems. (See *Introduction.*)

Publishes *Quarterly Journal of Speech* and *Monographs.*

National Council of Teachers of English.

Conventions devoted to reports of experimental and research activities, often including material of interest to teachers of Speech.

Publishes *English Journal* and *Elementary English Review.*

Educational Research Service, National Education Association. Department of Superintendence and Research Division, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C.

Conducted survey of speech correction facilities (see *Surveys*) and probably anxious to encourage further research in this field.

Modern Language Association of America. (See *Associations.*)

Publishes *P.M.L.A.* (see *Periodicals*) and bibliographic yearbooks (see *Bibliographies*). Material often of interest to teachers of Speech.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Commonwealth Fund, 41 East 57 Street, New York City.

Heckscher Foundation for the Advancement of Research, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

These three foundations have supported research work in Speech education, such as the publication of bibliographic material and the financing of surveys.

Surveys

(See also *Curriculum*)

A. General

1. *Best Complete One*

Smith, Dora V. *Instruction in English.* Bulletin, U. S. Office of Education, 1932, No. 17. (National Survey of Secondary Education Monograph No. 20.) Washington, D. C., 1932. 88 p.

Surveys the field completely, including: Administrative Set-up for Curriculum Making in English; Relation to the General Objectives of Education; Time Allotments in Secondary School English; Correlation; College Entrance Requirements in English; The Teaching of Composition, Grammar, Reading and Literature; Provision for Individual Differences; Summary and Conclusions.

These are some of the chapter headings in this report on the present status of English in the secondary curriculum. Speech is considered coevally as the oral phase of the English instruction.

2. *Extremely Valuable*

Meader, Emma G. *Teaching Speech in the Elementary School.* Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928. 129 p.

Comparison of speech programs on the elementary level in England with those in the United States, based on the author's personal visits and experience. Presents "Suggestions for a Constructive Program of Speech Education in the United States," including preparation of teachers, curriculum, and methods.

3. *Older, but Still Valuable*

The Teaching of English in England. Board of Education, London, England. His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1921. 394 p.

The report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Board of Education to inquire into the position of English in the Educational System of England. Discussion over time to be allotted; Elementary Level—Speech Training, Oral Expression, Reading Aloud; Secondary Level—English in Commerce and in Life; Training of Teachers—Phonetics and Oral Tests; Theses and Research; Drama as an Educational Activity; Adult Education.

Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools. Bulletin, U. S. Bureau of Education, 1917, No. 2. Washington, D. C., 1917. 181 p.

Report by the National Joint Committee on English representing the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education of the National Education Association and the National Council of Teachers of English. P. 85-94, "Report of the Committee on Oral English," is particularly important for teachers of Speech.

B. Administration

National Survey of the Education of Teachers. Vol. 1, *Selected Bibliography.* U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1933, No. 10. Washington, D. C., 1933. 118 p.

An annotated bibliography on items in English and Speech is included (p. 24), referring to material on the status of salaries, administration, training of teachers, etc.

Alexander, Carter and Covert, Timon. *Bibliography on School Finance, 1923–31.* Prepared for The National Survey of School Finance.

U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1932, No. 15. Washington, D. C., 1932. 343 p.

Includes annotated bibliography in financial aspects of Schools for Deaf (p. 65), including material on Salaries, Pensions, School Costs, etc.

C. Speech Correction

1. *Best Single One*

Rogers, James Frederick. *The Speech Defective School Child—What Our Schools Are Doing for Him.* Bulletin, U. S. Office of Education, 1931, No. 7. Washington, D. C., 1931. 31 p.

Survey of what facilities our schools have for speech correction and the special work being done for Speech Defective Children in City School Systems. Includes type records and forms, degree of prevalence of defects, etc.

2. *Helpful*

Martens, Elise H. "Education of Exceptional Children." *Biennial Survey of Education, 1928–1930,* Vol. I, p. 381–418. U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1931, No. 20. Washington, D. C., 1931. 807 p.

A review of the work being done for this group in the schools of the nation, including the program for speech defectives, and deaf and hard of hearing children.

3. *Physical Facilities*

a. *School*

Educational Research Service of National Education Association. *Survey of the Special Classes for Handicapped Children in 25 Large Cities.* Circular No. 6, May, 1930. Department of Superintendence and Research Division, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., 1930. 16 p.

On p. 7, Table 3, Speech Correction facilities are set forth, and on p. 4, Table 1, those for treating the Deaf and Hard of Hearing.

b. *College and University Study*

Voelker, Charles H. "A Survey of Speech Correction in Colleges and Universities." *Q.J.S.* 19:403–408, June, 1933.

Discussion and table of results of investigation concerning offerings in the field of Speech Correction by colleges, covering presence of clinics, courses for defectives and therapists, facilities for major, number of courses offered, etc. See also corrections in *Q.J.S.* 19:573.

c. *Clinics Available, Metropolitan Area, New York City*

List of clinics in New York City available at Speech Department Office, Teachers College, Columbia University, or Speech Improvement Office, Board of Education, 500 Park Avenue, New York City.

Teacher Training

A. Facilities (See *Curriculum*)

Weaver, J. C. *A Survey of Speech Curricula.*

Voelker, C. H. *A Survey of Speech Correction in Colleges and Universities.* (See *Surveys—Speech Correction—College and University Study.*)

B. SUGGESTED PROGRAMS

Meader, Emma G. *Teaching of Speech in the Elementary School.* (See *Curriculum* and *Surveys.*)

Compares the elementary speech program of the United States with that of England, presenting recommendations and suggestions for the speech entrance requirements to normal school, the normal school course requirements in speech, and speech courses for teachers in service.

C. OLDER CRITICISM

The Teaching of English in England. Board of Education, London, England. (See *Curriculum* and *Surveys.*)

A great deal of discussion is included on the proper training of teachers, e.g., Shall they take an oral test? How much Phonetics is desirable in their training? etc.

Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools. (See *Curriculum* and *Surveys.*)

Recommendations of this committee for more adequate training of teachers, under "Report of the Committee on Oral English," p. 85–94.

A WORKING BIBLIOGRAPHY ON CONVERSATION

ROBERT T. OLIVER

Vancouver Junior College

THE chief difficulty in preparing this bibliography—aside from the primary one of locating the titles—has been to establish the limits of the subject. Emerson confounds conversation and manners, or all social intercourse. Several writers on the subject would debar all purposive talks, which they would classify as conferences. Others refuse to consider frivolous, frothy talk as conversation. Both kinds should, of course, be included. One type of material which I have largely excluded is collections, real or imaginary, of conversation. Such books as the *Conversations of Ben Jonson with Drummond of Hawthornden*, the *Table Talk* of John Selden, or of S. T. Coleridge, the *Imaginary Conversations* of W. S. Landor, etc. are of this class. These have a decided value for the study of conversation, but as they are in a class by themselves, they should be placed in a separate bibliography. Such works of this nature as I have included

—i.e., Boswell's *Johnson*, and the *Breakfast Table* series of Holmes—contain many enlightening observations upon conversation.

My hope is that this shall prove indeed a "working" bibliography, and that it shall provide the needed sinews for a series of courses in conversation. This is a large field of speech activity whose considerable importance should rescue it from its present pedagogical neglect. A recent text on public speaking asserts that "The new public speaking is conference-room speaking," and it is true that conversation is now assuming an importance in the business world equal to that which it has always held in the social sphere. Teachers of speech owe it to themselves, and to their students, to assume the leadership in developing this art to its highest plane of efficiency and enjoyment. The insistent frequency with which articles on conversation have appeared during the last quarter-century should serve at once as a challenge and as an opportunity to the speech profession. It remains to be seen whether the departments of public speaking will answer the challenge, or let the opportunity for wider service and development pass into the hands of others.

BOOKS AND BOUND ESSAYS[1]

1. Addison, Joseph, "Characters in Conversation Described as Instruments of Music," *Tatler*, Saturday, April 1, 1710. (No. 153.)
2. Addison, Joseph, "Clubs," *Spectator*, Saturday, March 10, 1711. (No. 9.)
3. Addison, Joseph, "Female Orators," *Spectator*, Thursday, December 13, 1711. (No. 247.)
4. Addison, Joseph, "On Conversation—Letter by the Ambassador of Bantam," *Spectator*, Monday, June 30, 1714. (No. 557.)
5. Addison, Joseph, "On Method in Writing and Conversation," *Spectator*, Friday, September 5, 1713. (No. 476.)
6. Ainger, Alfred, "Art of Conversation," in *Lectures and Essays*, vol. ii, pp. 271–92, Macmillan, n. d.
7. American Institute of Child Life, Literary Staff, *Table Talk in the Home*, No. 23, *The American Home Series*, Norman E. Richardson, gen. ed., New York and Cincinnati, The Abingdon Press, n. d.
8. Bacon, Francis, "Of Discourse," in *Essays*, ed. F. G. Selby, London, Macmillan, 1892.
9. Baker, J., *Art of Conversation*, Evanston, Ill., Correct English Pub. Co., 1907.
10. Bate, John, *Talkers*, with Illustrations, London, Elliot Stock, 1878.
11. Benson, A. C., "Art of Conversation," pp. 238–42; "Conversation," pp. 250–61; "Talk," pp. 243–49, in *Rambles and Reflections*, Putnam, 1926.
12. Benson, A. C., "Conversation," (another essay) in *Along the Road*, pp. 359–66, Putnam, 1926.

[1] Where place of publication is not given, it is New York.

13. Bennett, Arnold, "Talking," in *Savour of Life*, pp. 206–13, Doubleday Doran, 1928.
14. Bingham, W. V. and Moore, B. V., *How to Interview*, Harper's, 1930.
15. Borden, Richard C., and Busse, Alvin C., *How to Win an Argument*, New York and London, Harper's, 1926.
16. Boswell, James, *Life of Dr. Samuel Johnson*, 2 Vols. in one, London, Oxford University Press, 1927.
17. Chesterfield, Philip Dormer Stanhope, 4th Earl of, Letters, ed. with intro. by Bonamy Dobrée, 4 vols. London, Eyre and Spottiswoode, Ltd. and New Jersey, Viking Press, Inc., 1932.
18. Clapp, J. M., "Conversation—Business Interviews," in *Talking Business*, Part IV, pp. 285–384, Ronald Press, 1928.
19. Clapp, J. M., and Kane, E. A., *How to Talk*, Ronald Press, 1928.
20. Colton, Ethel, *Keeping Mentally Alive*, Putnam, 1931.
21. Conklin, Mary Greer, *Conversation, What to Say and How to Say It*, New York and London, Funk and Wagnalls, 1912, 8th ed., 1930.
22. Cowper, William, "Conversation," (poem), "On Conversation," (essay), and "Table Talk," (poem), in *Poetry and Prose*, ed. H. S. Milford, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1921.
23. Craig, Alice E., "Conversation and Courtesy," in *The Speech Arts*, chapt. xxii, Macmillan, 1926.
24. De Quincey, Thomas, "Conversation," in *Essays*, ed. Whibley, London, Blackie and Son, n. d.
25. Dewey, John, "Events and Meanings," in *Characters and Events*, vol. 1, pp. 125–29, Henry Holt, 1929.
26. Dimnet, Abbé Ernest, "The Adventure of Conversation," in *What We Live By*, Simon and Schuster, 1923.
27. Eichler, Lillian, *Well-Bred English*, Doubleday, 1926. (Contains Bibliography.)
28. Elliott, Harrison Sacket, *The Process of Group Thinking*, Association Press, 1932.
29. Emerson, Ralph Waldo, "Clubs," vol. VII, pp. 211–36, "Considerations by the Way," vol. VI, pp. 231–64, "Inspiration," vol. VIII, pp. 276–8, "Social Aims," vol. VIII, pp. 77–106, and "Society and Solitude," vol. VII, pp. 7–20, in *Works*, Riverside Edition, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1898.
30. Fielding, Henry, "Art of Conversation," in *Works*, ed. George Saintsbury, Harper's, n. d.
31. Franklin, Benjamin, *How to Make Conversation More Pleasant*, (2c) Taylorville, Ill., Parker Pub. Co., n. d.
32. Gardiner, A. G., "On Talk and Talkers," in Tanner, and Tanner, eds., *Modern Familiar Essays*, pp. 210–14, Boston, Little, Brown and Co., 1927. Also in *Leaves in the Wind*, E. P. Dutton and Co. (first pub.)
33. Goodspeed, E. J., "Art of Being Outshone," in Del Plaine, F. K., and Grandy, A. G., *Current Prose*, Macmillan, 1931. *Also in Buying Happiness* by the author, University of Chicago Press, pp. 14–28, 1932. Also in Heydrick, *Familiar Essays of To-Day*, Scribner's, 1930, pp. 121–33.

34. Graves, Richard, "On Conversation," in *Senilities; or Solitary Amusements: In Prose and Verse: with a Cursory Disquisition on the Future Condition of the Sexes*, pp. 69–75. London, T. N. Longman and O. Rees; and Bath, J. Browne, 1801.
35. Guazzo, Stephen, *The Civile Conversation*, written first in Italian, and now translated out of French by George Pettie, divided into four bookes (of which only three appeared), Richard Watkins, London, 1581. Second ed., 1586, with fourth book translated by Barth Young. Issued anew with intro. by Sir Edward Sullivan, in 2 vols., London, Constable and Co., and New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1925. (A Tudor Reprint.)
36. Hall, Florence Howe, *A-B-C of Correct Speech and the Art of Conversation*, New York and London, Harper's, 1916.
37. Harrington, W. L. and Fulton, M. G., *Talking Well*, Macmillan, 1924.
38. Hazlitt, William, "Conversation of Lords," in *Collected Works*, ed. Waller, A. R., and Glover, A., London, J. M. Dent, 1904.
39. Hervey, George Winfred, *The Rhetoric of Conversation; or, Bridles and Spurs for the Management of the Tongue*, Harper's, 1854.
40. Heseltine, Olive, *Conversation (a history)*, Dutton, 1927.
41. Hewitt, E., *Ease in Conversation, Phila.*, Macrae and Smith, n. d.
42. Holmes, O. W., *The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin. First pub. 1858.
43. Holmes, O. W., *The Poet at the Breakfast Table*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin. First pub. 1872.
44. Holmes, O. W., *The Professor at the Breakfast Table*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin. First pub. 1859.
45. *How to Shine in Society*, (anon.) Fitsgerald Pub. Co.
46. *How to Talk and Debate*, (anon.) Ogilvie Pub. Co.
47. Johnson, Dr. Samuel, "Punch and Conversation," in *Idler*; 1758–60, 2 vols., I, 190–4. London, J. Newberry, 1761.
48. Johnson, Dr. Samuel, "The Danger of Attempting Wit in Conversation," *Rambler*, July 23, 1751. Reprinted in four vols., London, W. Strahan, etc., 1784, 10th ed.; III, 211–16.
49. Johnson, Dr. Samuel, "The Difference Between an Author's Writing and His Conversation," *Rambler*, May 5, 1750. I, 80–6, of *Rambler*, 4 vols., London, W. Strahan, etc., 1784, 10th ed.
50. Kleiser, G., *How to Improve Your Conversation*, Funk and Wagnalls, 1932.
51. Krans, H. S., ed., *The Lost Art of Conversation*, selected essays, Sturgis and Walton, 1910.
52. L'Isle André, Ives Marie de, *The Art of Conversing*, trans. from the French, London, 1777.
53. Littel, R., "It's a Long Subject," in *Read America First*, pp. 46–51, Harcourt Brace, 1926.
54. Longbridge, F., "Terrors of Talk," in Gay, R. M. ed., *Fact, Fancy and Opinion*, pp. 301–2, Boston, Little, Brown and Co., 1923.
55. Lynd, Robert, "Silence," in *Money-Box*, pp. 142–48, Appleton, 1926.
56. Mabie, H. M., "Magic of Talk," in *My Study Fire*, series 2, p. 29, Dodd Mead, 1899.

57. Mahaffy, Sir J. P., *Conversation*, 1896, Phila., 1911.
58. Mahaffy, Sir J. P., *Principles of the Art of Conversation*, London and New York, Macmillan, 1887.
59. Marcosson, I. F., *Adventure in Interviewing*, John Lane Co., 1919.
60. Maurois, André, *Conversation*, E. P. Dutton, n. d.
61. Morley, C. D., "What Men Live By," in Chamberlain, E., ed., *Essays Old and New*, pp. 64–66, Harcourt Brace, 1926.
62. Morris, Charles, ed.-in-chief, "The Art of Conversation," *Everybody's Encyclopedia*, pp. 387–395, Copyright, 1907. No publisher or place given.
63. Nicoll, W. R., "Art of Conversation," in *Letters on Life*, p. 25, Doran, 1911.
64. O'Neill, J. M., and Weaver, A. T., "Private Speaking," in *The Elements of Speech*, chapt. xx, 345–54, Longmans, Green and Co. (1926) 6th ed., 1932.
65. Overstreet, H. A., *Influencing Human Behavior*, People's Institute, 1925.
66. Peabody, A. P., *Conversation*, Boston, Lothrop, Lee, and Shepherd, 1882.
67. Priestly, J. B., *Talking*, boards, Harper's, 1926.
68. Rand, W. R., "Conversation," in *Spare Moments*, pp. 61–64, Boston, McGrath Sherrill Press, 1926.
69. Repplier, Agnes, "Luxury of Conversation," in *Compromises*, pp. 1–19, Houghton Mifflin, 1913.
70. Richardson, Samuel, "Letter VIII. General Rules for Agreeable Conversation in a Young Man. From a Father to his Son," in *Familiar Letters*, London, 1741. Re-edited by Brian W. Downs, London, George Routledge, 1928.
71. Steele, Sir Richard, "Rules for Pleasing in Conversation," in *The Guardian*, reprinted in two vols., I, 99–104. Dublin, George Risk, etc., 7th ed., 1752.
72. Steele, Sir Richard, "Jack Lizard," "Old Age and Conversation," and "On Conversation," reprinted in *Select Essays of Sir Richard Steele*, ed. L. E. Steele, 1907.
73. Steele, Sir Richard, "The Conversation of Military Men," No. 152, Aug. 24, 1711. *The Spectator*, Everyman, II, 253–6.
74. Stevenson, R. L., "Talk and Talkers," in *Memories and Portraits*, Scribner's, 1894.
75. Stimson, E. G., *Conversation and a Magnetic Personality*, Holyoke, Mass., Elizabeth Towne Co., Inc.; 1924.
76. Swift, Jonathan, "A Complete Collection of General and Ingenious Conversation, according to the most Polite Mode and Method, now used at Court, and in the best Companies of England," vol. IX, pp. 339–469, *Works*, in 19 vols., ed. Sir Walter Scott, London, Bickers and son, and Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1883.
77. Swift, Jonathan, "Hints toward an Essay on Conversation," in vol. IX, pp. 167–177, *Works*, in 19 vols., ed. Sir Walter Scott, London, Bickers and Son, and Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1883.
78. Taft, Henry W., *An Essay on Conversation*, Macmillan, 1827.
79. Taft, Henry W., *Kindred Arts, Conversation and Public Speaking*, boards, Macmillan, 1929.

80. Tinker, C. B., *The Salon and English Letters*, Macmillan, 1915.
81. Van Dyke, Henry, "Talkability," in *Fisherman's Luck and Some Other Uncertain Things*," Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905. Also found in Pence, R. W., ed., *Essays by Present Day Writers*, pp. 313–27, Macmillan, 1924.
82. Warner, C. D., "Dinner-Table Talk," in *As We Were Saying*, Harper and Bros., 1893. Also found in Pritchard, F. N., ed., *From Confucius to Mencken*, pp. 891–93, Harper and Bros., 1929.
83. Warner, C. D., "Is There Any Conversation?" in *As We Go*, Harper's, 1904.
84. Wheeler, R. E., *Famous Bluestockings*, 1910.
85. Wolcott, I. B., *What to Talk About*, Putnam, 1923.
86. Woolbert, Charles Henry, "The Approved Speaking Mode," in *The Fundamentals of Speech*, chapt. 3, pp. 21–40, Harper's, 1927, Rev. ed.

Periodical Essays

1. Abbot, L., "Temple: The Tongue," *Outlook*, 92:842–4 (Aug. 7, 1909).
2. Aikman, D., "What Babbitt Won't Talk About," *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, 152:540–8 (April, 1926).
3. Ainger, A., "Art of Conversation," *Living Age*, 245:21–23 (April, 1, 1905).
4. Ainslie, D., "Talkers and Conversationalists," *Living Age*, 303:220–8 (October 25, 1919).
5. Allen, F. L., "And How Are They All?" *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, 157:118–20 (June, 1928).
6. Alvey, Edward, Jr., "Organizing Units Around Functional Centers," ("A set of assignments for the teaching of conversation.") *English Journal*, 22, No. 2 (February, 1933), pp. 119–27.
7. Anon., "A Few Conversationalists," *Living Age*, 233:547–58 (May 31, 1902).
8. Anon., "Aids to Conversation," *Harper's Weekly*, 48:1310 (August 27, 1904).
9. Anon., "Argument in Conversation," *Saturday Review*, 90:453.
10. Anon., "Art of Talking in India," illustrated, *Literary Digest*, 99:19 (November 17, 1928).
11. Anon., "Bores," *Living Age*, 260:121–3 (Jan. 9, 1909); same, *Harper's Weekly*, 53:6 (Jan. 16, 1909).
12. Anon., "Charm of Commonplace," *Living Age*, 270:692–5 (Sept. 9, 1911).
13. Anon., "Charm of Quotation," *Living Age*, 226:582–4 (Sept. 1, 1900).
14. Anon., "Clean Conversation," *Outlook*, 82:301–2 (Feb. 10, 1906).
15. Anon., "Conversation," *New Statesman*, 19:484–6 (Aug. 5, 1922).
16. Anon., "Conversational Argument," *Living Age*, 227:459–62 (Nov. 17, 1900); same, *Current Literature*, 30:604 (May, 1901).
17. Anon., "Conversation and Specialism," *Scribner's Magazine*, 28:249–50 (Aug., 1900).
18. Anon., "Conversation as an Art," *Harper's Weekly*, 52:7–8 (Jan. 25, 1908).
19. Anon., "Conversation," *Atlantic Monthly*, 128:570–2 (Oct., 1921).

20. Anon., "Crime of Talking Shop," *Atlantic Monthly*, 106:426–7 (Sept., 1910).
21. Anon., "Dialect of Emotion," *Atlantic Monthly*, 101:286–8 (Feb., 1908).
22. Anon., "Do Women Enjoy One Another?" *Atlantic Monthly*, 97:586–7 (June, 1906).
23. Anon., "Few Conversationalists," *Living Age*, 233:547–58 (May 31, 1902).
24. Anon., "Folks Who Talk Too Much," *American Magazine*, 95:45 (Jan., 1923).
25. Anon., "Games and Talk," *Nation*, 89:593–4 (Dec. 16, 1909).
26. Anon., "Good Talk," *Outlook*, 147:516 (Dec. 28, 1927).
27. Anon., "Good Talk," *Saturday Review of Literature*, 5:365 (Nov. 17, 1928).
28. Anon, "Gossip, and What to Do about It," *Harper's Bazaar*, 34:739–42 (March 23, 1901).
29. Anon., "Grumbling and Good Feeling," *Current Literature*, 30:602 (May, 1901).
30. Anon., "Guide to Conversation," *Living Age*, 298:302–3 (Aug. 2, 1918).
31. Anon., "How I Made Men Come to Me," *Ladies Home Journal*, 29:10 May, 1912).
32. Anon., "Is Conversation a Lost Art?" *Nation*, 88:377–8 (April 15, 1909).
33. Anon., "Legitimate Limits of the Joke," *Living Age*, 279:116–19 (Oct. 11, 1913).
34. Anon., "Literature of Table Talk," *Living Age*, 251:439–41 (Nov. 17, 1906).
35. Anon., "Little Conversations," *Living Age*, 267:314–6 (Oct. 29, 1910).
36. Anon., "Loneliness in Modern Life," *Craftsman*, 19:638 (March, 1911).
37. Anon., "Loquacity: A Diagnosis," *Outlook*, 60:183–4 (Aug. 6, 1927).
38. Anon., "Lost Art," *Living Age*, 235:351 (Nov. 8, 1902).
39. Anon., "Lost Art of Conversation," *Living Age*, 263:312–5 (Oct. 30, 1909).
40. Anon., "Making Conversation," *Nation*, 104:752 (June 28, 1917).
41. Anon., "Man and Conversation," *Current Literature*, 30:261 (March, 1901).
42. Anon., "Obstinacy in Conversation," *North American Review*, 183:948–50, (Nov. 2, 1906); same, *Harper's Bazaar*, 41:199 (Feb., 1907).
43. Anon., "On the Taxable Possibilities of Excess Conversation," *Atlantic Monthly*, 129:135–6 (Jan., 1922).
44. Anon., "Oral Expression in Secondary Schools," *Q.J.P.S.*, 3:317–26 (Oct., 1917).
45. Anon., "Passing Remarks," *Living Age*, 269:691–3 (June 10, 1911).
46. Anon., "Plea for Loquacity," *North American Review*, 187:798–800 (May, 1908); same, *Harper's Bazaar*, 42:612–3 (June, 1908).
47. Anon., "Precisian," *Living Age*, 278:60–2 (July 5, 1913).
48. Anon., "Qualities of American Conversation," *Atlantic Monthly*, 81:286.
49. Anon., "Question Asking," *Outlook*, 101:130–1 (May 18, 1912).
50. Anon., "Saviours of Conversation," *Literary Digest*, 71:29 (Nov. 26, 1921).
51. Anon., "Signalling for Conversation," *Outlook*, 93:526–7 (Nov. 6, 1909).

52. Anon., "Spencer's Cure for Garrulity," *Scientific American Supplement*, 54:22270 (Aug. 23, 1902).
53. Anon., "Table Talk at Home," *Outlook*, 90:572–4 (Nov. 14, 1908).
54. Anon., "Tact to Listen," *Living Age*, 243:563–5 (Nov. 26, 1904).
55. Anon., "Talk and Philosophy," *Nation*, 115:6 (July 5, 1922).
56. Anon., "Talking About the Weather," *Independent*, 75:126–7 (July 17, 1913).
57. Anon., "Talk of Robert Louis Stevenson," *Scribner's Magazine*, 28:507–8 (Oct. 25, 1919).
58. Anon., "Tea Parties," *Living Age*, 256:183–5 (Jan. 18, 1908).
59. Anon., "Tear for Conversation," Bookman, 65:117–8 (April, 1928).
60. Anon., "The Floor," Atlantic Monthly, 120:714–16 (Nov., 1917).
61. Anon., "Uses of Repartee," *Outlook*, 102:13–5 (Sept. 7, 1912).
62. Anon., "Vernomania—a Newly Discovered Malady," *Current Literature*, 53:432–3 (Oct., 1912).
63. Anon., "Wanted: More Talk," *Atlantic Monthly*, 131:569–71 (April, 1923).
64. Anon., "What the Quiet Firesides Say," *Literary Digest*, 52:779 (March 18, 1916).
65. Anon., "What Women Talk About," *Woman's Home Companion*, 53:4 (June, 1926).
66. Anon., "When in Rome," *Living Age*, 274:634–5 (Sept. 7, 1912).
67. Aria, E., "About Conversation," *Fortnightly Review*, 107:699–704 (April, 1917); same, *Living Age*, 294:607–11 (Sept. 8, 1917).
68. Barry, J. D., "School for Conversation," *Harper's Bazaar*, 43:1055–9 (Nov., 1909).
69. Bell, Mrs. Hugh, "Wordless," *Spectator*, 92:953.
70. Benson, A. C., "British Uncommunicativeness," *Century*, 86:567–9 (Aug., 1913).
71. Benson, A. C., "Good Conversation," *Living Age*, 247:146–52 (Oct. 21, 1905).
72. Betham-Edwards, M., "The Vanished Salon; or the Lost Art of Conversation," *Chamber's Journal*, 83:122.
73. Bourne, R., "On Discussion," *New Republic*, 7:87–9 (May 27, 1916).
74. Boutelle, G. H., "Who Let in the Hippopotamus?" *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, 143:800–2 (Nov., 1921).
75. Bradford, Gamaliel, "The Journal of a Man of Letters," *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, April, 1933.
76. Coe, M., "Making One's Contribution," *New Republic*, 8:91–2 (Aug. 26, 1916).
77. Collier, P., "Extemporaneous Sociability," *North American Review*, 186:537–45 (Dec., 1907).
78. Cooper, F. T., "Technique of Conversation and Some Recent Fiction," *Bookman*, 37:438–45 (June, 1913).
79. Cornish, F. M., "Talk About the Weather," *Living Age*, 273:567–70 (June 1, 1912).
80. Davis, E., "How Much Talk Is Too Much?" *World Today*, 53:467–72 (April, 1929).
81. Davis, E., "Why Be a Bore?" *World Today*, 54:224–8 (Aug., 1929).

82. Dodd, E., "Personal Expression in the High School," *Q.J.S.E.*, 4:440–6 (Jan., 1918).
83. Dyer, W. P., "Developing the Art of Conversation as a Form of Culture," *English Journal*, 15:276–80 (April, 1926).
84. Eggleston, K., "Don't Talk About Yourself," illustrated, *Delineator*, 78:390 (Nov., 1911).
85. Ervine, St. J. G., "Lost Art of Conversation," *Living Age*, 279:821–3 (Dec. 27, 1913).
86. Firkins, O. W., "Better Part in Conversation," *North American Review*, 198:383–93 (Sept., 1913).
87. Fisher, J. R., "Bludgeon in the Drawing Room," *Harper's Weekly*, 54:25 (April 23, 1910).
88. Gaylord, J. S., "Beginnings of Expression," *Q.J.P.S.*, 2:186–92 (April, 1916).
89. Gilman, L., "Royal Road to Affability," *North American Review*, 218:410–16 (Sept., 1923).
90. Goodspeed, Edgar J., "The Art of Being Outshone," *Atlantic Monthly*, 144:801–5 (1929); same, *Reader's Digest*, 8:865–7 (1930).
91. Gregory, A., "Conversation in Ireland," *Independent*, 74:857–60 (April 17, 1913).
92. Gregory, E., "Is Conversation a Lost Art?" *Harper's Bazaar*, 34:739–42 (March 23, 1901).
93. Guest, E. A., "Gossip! The Meanest Habit in the World," *American Magazine*, 104:7–9 (Nov., 1927).
94. Hackett, F., "Loquacious Man: His Answer to Mrs. Miller" (cf. item 128), *New Republic*, 18:302–3 (April 5, 1919).
95. Hall, F. H., "Art of Being Agreeable," *Harper's Bazaar*, 44:197 (March, 1910).
96. Hamby, W. H., "You Won't Be Snubbed," *Ladies Home Journal*, 36:117–8 (May, 1919).
97. Harbour, H. H., "Tediums of Conversation," *Atlantic Monthly*, 105:794–6 (June, 1910).
98. Harris, A. M., "Fostering Oral English," *Q.J.S.E.*, 11:124–30 (April, 1925).
99. Harris, M., "On Being Silent," *Sewanee Review*, 29:59–65 (Jan., 1921).
100. Harris, M., "Gossip and Gossipers," *Poet Lore*, 33:291–9 (June, 1922).
101. Harrison, E. B., "Ideal of Table Talk," *Nineteenth Century*, 556:790–5 (Nov., 1904).
102. Herklots, H. G. G., "Agreeable Conversation," *Nation*, 46:799–800 (March 15, 1913).
103. Herring, B. F., "Special Course in Oral Expression for High Schools," *Q.J.P.S.*, 3:140–52 (April, 1917).
104. Hough, D., "Gift of the Gods," *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, 153:386–8 (Aug., 1926).
105. Howes, R. F., "Cowper on Conversation," *Q.J.S.*, 18:30–45 (Feb., 1932).
106. Howes, R. F., "The Importance of Coleridge's Talk," *Q.J.S.*, 14:563–75 (Nov., 1928).
107. Howes, R. F., "Jonathan Swift and Conversation in the Coffee House," *Q.J.S.*, 14:14–24 (Feb., 1931).

108. Howes, R. F., "Training in Conversation," Bibliography, *Q.J.S.*, 14:253–60 (April, 1929).
109. Hulbert, G. W., "Conversational Basis," *English Journal*, 16:302–7 (April, 1927).
110. Kelley, F. C., "Gossip as an Art of Barter," *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, 146:675–6 (April, 1923).
111. Kelly, R., "College and Conversation," *Dial*, 61:451–2 (Nov. 30, 1916); same, condensed, *Literary Digest*, 54:20 (Jan. 6, 1917).
112. Kerr, S., "It's Not in the Etiquette Book, But . . .," illustrated, *Woman's Home Companion*, 55:9 (Jan., 1928).
113. Kingsland, Mrs. B., "Conversation and Good Form in Public Places," *Ladies Home Journal*, 17:22 (Aug., 1900).
114. Kirkland, W., "Imaginary Conversations," *Outlook*, 129:527–8 (Nov. 30, 1921).
115. Landis, C., "National Differences in Conversation," table, *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 21:354–7 (Jan., 1927).
116. Lindsay, J. A., "Talk and Table Talk," *Nineteenth Century*, 95:69–77 (Jan., 1924).
117. Littel, P., "Ability to Remember Things," *New Republic*, 17:345–6 (Jan. 18, 1919).
118. Little, R., "It's a Long Subject," *New Republic*, 42:187 (April 8, 1925).
119. Logan, J. D., "Psychology of Gossip," *Canadian Magazine*, 31:106–11 (June, 1908); same, condensed, *Current Literature*, 45:214–7 (Aug., 1908).
120. Longbridge, "Terrors of Talk," *Living Age*, 306:160–3 (July 7, 1920).
121. Lynd, R., "Gas Stoves," *Saturday Review*, 146:756 (Dec. 8, 1928).
122. Lyttleton, E., "Some Snares for Story Telling," *Nineteenth Century*, 101:120–4 (July, 1927).
123. Matthews, B., "Art of Repartee," illustrated, *Century*, 84:619–24 (Aug., 1912).
124. Matthews, B., "Compliments of the Season: The Retort Courteous," *Century*, 111:129–35 (Dec., 1925).
125. Merington, M. E., "Art of Conversation," *Chatauquan*, 30:481–4 (Feb., 1900).
126. Meyer, J. A., "Golden Word," *Putnam's Magazine*, 1:71–5 (Oct., 1906).
127. Middleton, R., "Conversational Misers," *Living Age*, 272:573–5 (March 2, 1912).
128. Miller, Mrs. A. D., "Silent Woman," *New Republic*, 18:301–2 (April 5, 1919). (Cf. item 94.)
129. Miner, J. B., "New Type of College Course: Conference on Life Interests," *School and Society*, 22:416–22 (Oct. 3, 1925).
130. Morten, A. H., "Conversational Circle; Some Problems for the Leader," *Century*, 34:952.
131. Newcomb, C. M., "Educational Values of Expression," *Q.J.P.S.*, 3:69–79 (Jan., 1917).
132. Nook, A. J., "Decline of Conversation," *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, 152:696–702 (May, 1926).
133. Oliver, F. E., "Art of Conversation," *Harper's Bazaar*, 46:253 (May, 1912).

134. Oliver, F. E., "Conversation and Good English," *Harper's Bazaar*, 46:455 (Sept., 1912).
135. Oliver, F. E., "Faults in Daily Speech," *Harper's Bazaar*, 46:301 (June, 1912).
136. Oliver, F. E., "How to Talk Well," *Harper's Bazaar*, 46:301 (June, 1912).
137. Oliver, R. T., "Conversation in the Speech Curriculum," *Q.J.S.*, 18:108–11 (Feb., 1932).
138. Oliver, R. T., "The Growth of Interest in Conversation," *English Journal*, College Edition, 21:654–57 (Oct., 1932).
139. Payn, J., "Conversation," *Nineteenth Century*, 42:67.
140. Phillips, E. M., "Art of Conversation," *Nineteenth Century*, 73:682–93 (March, 1913); same, *Living Age*, 277:25–34 (April 5, 1913).
141. Phillips, L. M., "Modern Thought and the Renaissance," *Living Age*, 280:67–77 (Jan. 10, 1914).
142. Phillips, R. L., "Lady Who Threw Her Slipper, and Others," *Outlook*, 138:598–601 (Dec. 10, 1924).
143. Pier, A. S., "Quiet Man," *Atlantic Monthly*, 93:830–6 (June, 1904).
144. Pier, F., "Extracting Flavor," *Harper's Weekly*, 55:26 (Aug. 12, 1911).
145. Priestly, J. B., "Character of Talk," *English Review*, 42:207–16 (Aug., 1926).
146. Priestly, J. B., "Enemies of Talk," *Fortnightly Review*, 126:57–67 (July, 1926); same, *Bookman*, 64:6–12 (Sept., 1926).
147. Priestly, J. B., "Some Criticisms of Good Talk," *Blackwood's Magazine*, 219:609–18 (May, 1926).
148. Repplier, Agnes, "What Shall We Talk About?" *Century*, 87:127–31 (Nov., 1931).
149. Reynolds, A., "Certain Kinds of Table Talk," *Century*, 82:466–7 (July, 1911).
150. Roberts, C. H., Jr., "Children at the Table with Their Parents," *Home Progress*, 2:53–55 (March, 1913).
151. Rowland, E. H., "Hints to Gossips," *Bookman*, 30:283–5 (Nov., 1909).
152. Russell, E. A., "Art of Expression: Its Importance in Business," *Craftsman*, 10:101–4 (April, 1906).
153. Saunders, W. O., "It Doesn't Pay to Talk Too Much," illustrated, *Collier's*, 75:12 (March 21, 1925).
154. Shand, A. I., "Conversation," *Living Age*, 255:166–9 (Oct. 19, 1900).
155. Stoke, S. M., and West, E. D., "Sex Differences in Conversational Interests," bibliography, table, *Journal of Social Psychology*, 2:120–6 (Feb., 1931).
156. Swink, R. A., "Vocal Expression in Perspective," *Q.J.P.S.*, 3:185–90 (April, 1917).
157. Tarbell, Ida M., "Talkative Women," *Woman's Home Companion*, 42:13 (Feb., 1915).
158. Tryon, L. H., "Reflections of a Housewife: Piazza Conversations," *House Beautiful*, 38:73–4 (Aug., 1915).
159. Vorse, M. H., "Freedom of Self-Expression," *Woman's Home Companion*, 41:4 (May, 1914).
160. Vorse, M. H., "Oratory in the Home," illustrated, *Woman's Home Companion*, 42:12 (July, 1915).

161. Warren, M. R., "Coddling the Ego," illustrated, *Collier's*, 50:16–17 (Feb. 15, 1913).
162. West, E. D., and Stoke, M. S., "Sex Differences in Conversational Interests," bibliography, table, *Journal of Social Psychology*, 2:120–6 (Feb., 1931).
163. Whitney, J. P., "Talk's the Thing," illustrated, *Independent*, 94:82 (April 13, 1918).
164. Williamson, W. H., "Concerning Conversation," *Spectator*, 145:305–6 (Sept. 6, 1930).
165. Willoughby, Raymond R., "The Functions of Conversation," *The Journal of Social Psychology*, III, No. 2 (May, 1932), pp. 146–59.
166. Yeats, J. B., "Can Americans Talk?" illustrated, *Harper's Weekly*, 53:6 (Jan. 16, 1909).
167. Yeats, J. B., "Talk and Talkers," *North American Review*, 213:527–38 (April, 1921).

CLINICAL AIDS IN THE FUNDAMENTAL COURSES*

BRYNG BRYNGELSON
University of Minnesota

IN THIS paper I should like to consider five major problems which confront a teacher of speech in determining what to do for a student needing help in voice and diction.

I am not at all certain that we in the field of speech know as yet what constitutes a good voice and good diction. Experimental work in the past decade has centered around poor voice and inadequate diction. Among the notable findings which might be called negative is the one which deals with breathing and its relation to vocalization. Principally from the laboratories of the University of Iowa have come the facts that breathing does not play as important a part in voice production as it was formerly believed to have played. Personally, I have never believed the positive relationship, although I must confess that fifteen years ago I was guilty of teaching exercises in breathing with the hope of improving the voice. Consequently, I am forced by my own conviction to eliminate from this discussion what has been considered a major problem in most previous discussions of voice, namely, the problem of breathing.

The problems which I wish to suggest as being of paramount

* Presented at the New York Convention of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH, December, 1933.

importance in voice and diction are: sidedness, sound discrimination, structural interferences, emotional disturbances, and hypersensitivities.

The first problem, that of sidedness, has to do with the rhythmic flow of nervous energy essential to the smooth movement of the muscles used in vocalization. For adequate vocalization a sufficiently strong motor lead control must reside on one side of the brain so as to bring under subservience the latent motor potentialities of the other side of the brain. When this dominance of one cerebral hemisphere over its homologue does not obtain, Dr. Travis tells us, we have the possibility of a conflict in the peripheral speech structures. In other words, strict onesidedness is the first essential of synchronized muscular action in speech. Peculiarly enough, the outward signs of that native sidedness are not reliable at all times. There are many people who claim right-handedness, and thus right-sidedness, because they do use the right hand in one or two major activities. But upon clinical examination we might discover that the hand is merely a superficial sign of native sidedness. Clinical tests and a case history might reveal that the right cerebral hemisphere, or the left hand, is the sponsor of speech activity. In any event, in teaching speech to a student, it is basically important to know whether or not that student is operating on his natural brain dominance, or whether he is operating on a margin of dominance which has beeen distributed by the process of shifting from his naturally preferred side.

Therefore, I would suggest that a laterality index of all speech students be obtained at the beginning of each term. This index can be computed from a twenty-item questionnaire preceded by a few general questions as to the sidedness of parents, history of any speech disturbance, and history of shift in the individual. The speech clinic should collect these data, analyze them, and advise the speech teacher as to the clinical procedure which might be necessary before further change in the particular individual's voice or articulation could be expected.

Second: Many students are unable to respond to training in articulation because they are not able to discriminate speech sounds. These students may be able to hear and to understand the teacher perfectly, but they may be unable to produce certain desirable sounds because of a deficiency in the central mechanism. Then too, some students may have faulty pronunciation because of deafness in certain frequency regions. For example, a student may not have a "th" or an "s" sound because he has never heard either one. I am assuming

that all of your speech students are tested as to auditory acuity, but I am suggesting that something additional be considered in the hearing problem. The clinician should help the teacher of speech both in the administration and analysis of the speech sound discrimination test and in the test of frequency deafness for the student with faulty diction.

Third: No voice or articulatory training should be initiated before a thorough laryngoscopic examination of the student has been made. A teacher will only waste time if she is working against such barriers as a too large or a too small tongue, irregular teeth formation, limited faucial opening into the buccal cavity, restricted tongue due to an abnormal phrenum, deviated septum, nasal stenosis, hypertrophied adenoids, inactive velum, and the vocal fold anomolies which are too numerous to mention. If these students are directed to a clinic they will, in all probability, be sent to an otolaryngologist or an oral surgeon to have those obstructions removed. If the vocal anatomy does not permit any alteration, it is pertinent that both the student and the teacher know that fact. A year ago a student who had had two quarters of speech work in an extension class came to us in the clinic. The instructor complained of hypernasality. Dozens of voice exercises had been unsuccessfully used upon the student. The clinic examination revealed a congenitally short velum and an abnormal phrenum. The oral surgeon clipped the phrenum and performed what is known as a push-back operation on the velum. Two months following this surgery the student's voice, with very little clinical training, had a normal distribution of nasality and an adequate diction according to the standards promoted by the particular speech instructor. My point is that had the speech teacher been aware of the possibilities of resonance derangement on a structural basis, the student would not have needed to have been disillusioned as to his voice and articulation problem, nor need he have suffered from two grades of "D" in speech.

The fourth problem concerns emotional stability. It is a well known fact that voice quality and diction vary with one's feelings. Too often in speech we are attempting to alter the peripheral mechanism without taking into consideration what might lie back of the inadequacies which we hear in the student's speech. Frequently, we have a student with a perfectly functioning one-sided nervous system, a normal vocal apparatus, and an adequate ego-ideal as to his success as a speaker, but still he produces unorthodox speech sounds. This student may have either a high pitch in sound production, a tre-

morous voice quality, or an incorrectly placed inflexion. The condition may be more serious than that of ordinary stage fright. The problem may have its setting in deep-seated inferiority which cannot be uprooted in the classroom. Here the clinician may be of aid by assisting the teacher in making a diagnosis which is arrived at by a careful clinical study of the case. I would even recommend that an emotional test be given to all speech classes at the beginning of the term, for it may serve to locate the possible emotional problems early in the course. I want to stress the fact that many classroom techniques in voice training produce only temporary changes, particularly when one deals with symptoms rather than with causes. For most cases in which there are emotional maladjustments, training in either voice or diction is futile.

Finally, I want to mention those in your classes who are unable to make satisfactory progress in speech training because of some outstanding difference in physical appearance. For example, it is a waste of both time and energy to attempt voice and diction training with a student who is hypersensitive to big feet, a large nose, red hair, or protruding teeth, and so on. In the classroom he may respond to voice training in spite of his blushes and shyness, but you can be assured that the effects of this training will disappear at the conclusion of the course unless you have first helped him with his attitude toward his club-feet, freckled face, glass eye, or obesity. Unless you as a teacher are frank, objective, and have a sense of humor about your own peculiarities or differences, I would suggest that you again ask the clinic to come to your aid. This student needs special training in speech under the heading of objective mental hygiene which any modern clinic should be equipped to give. It is at this point that the clinician is very close to the speech teacher because the therapy for this type of student should involve classroom training. The demonstration of one such student with a changed attitude toward his difference will do wonders for other students in the class who may be hiding behind some mask of hypersensitivity. Suppose you have a student who has been examined by a clinic, and it is discovered that no alteration of the speech apparatus can be made. This student can never profit by training, for his voice will always be low pitched, hypo-nasal, characteristic of the opposite sex, or otherwise defective, because of structural abnormalities or deficiencies. I would suggest that this student be considered as one of the fifth group, and that the same clinical therapy be applied to him.

I presume that to many of you it may seem that I have talked

about clinical aids which do not seem important. If this thought has come to you, it may be because your situation seems hopeless in that you do not have access to either a speech clinic or to a medical college. If such be the case, what I have said may be of comfort to you. If you are not as successful a teacher as you would like to be, or if the results of your voice and articulatory training have not been permanent, there is a bare possibility that you can offer explanations based on one of these briefly discussed problems. In that event, don't let your conscience be tormented. Your sins are forgiven.

PHONETIC DIFFICULTIES IN LEARNING ENGLISH

CHARLES H. VOELKER
Ohio State University

THIS paper attempts to list some of the difficulties in regard to specific phonetic sounds and general pronunciation that the student of American speech has in learning English as a secondary language. That is to say, it indicates some of the salient characteristics of foreign brogue or barbaralalia. The information is not an attempt at comprehensiveness, but merely to tabulate notes procured in the training of almost a hundred students of various nationalities. It is the hope of the author that this study will stimulate the comparison of notes among Americanization phoneticians, and in this way increase the as yet meagre amount of material on the subject.

The Swedes, Czechs, French, Spanish, Italians, Japanese, and Chinese, have no [æ] in their native language and as a result tend to substitute the nearest sound representative of the specific orthographic symbol which occurs in their own native language. This sound has to be taught to them as a new element. The Jews substitute an [ɛ] for the [æ]. Those who learned a Romance language first are likely to substitute [ɑ] for [æ].

The Chinese have difficulty with [e] because their native tongue has no such sound. Neither do they have an [ɛ], and for the most part tend to substitute [æ] which seems to be easier to acquire.

The Czechs, French, Spanish, Italians, and Japanese have considerable difficulty with [ɪ] because their primary language does not contain it. The Romance peoples, Chinese, Germans and Russians most often substitute an [i] for [ɪ].

The Japanese have difficulty with [ɒ] because they have none in their native tongue.

The [ɔ] presents considerable difficulty, as a result of the fact that the Swedes, Czechs, French, Spanish, Italians, and Chinese have no such sound in their native tongue.

Difficulties on the [U] are found among the Sweedes, Czechs, French, Spanish, Italians, and Japanese, since their language lacks this sound. The Romance peoples and Chinese substitute [u] for [U]. The Japanese have no [u].

Most foreigners fail to give [ə] the correct value in unstressed positions and polysyllabic words. This sound is foreign to Swedes, Czechs, French, Spanish, Italians, Japanese, and Chinese. In fact [ə], and especially [ʌ] are distinctly English sounds.

For the [j], the Germans often substitute [dʒ], the Spanish [dj], and the Chinese [dz].

Some Italians say [kwɑt] for [ʍɑt]. Many nationalities make substitutions for the [ʍ]. The Germans substitute [v] for [ʍ], the Russians and some Austrians [w]. This sound, of course, does not occur in Swedish, Spanish, French, Italian, nor Chinese.

For [w], the Chinese and Germans substitute [v]. The Swedes, Czechs, and Japanese have no [w] in their native tongue. It is a difficult sound for the Spanish because in their language it is not found except in combinations with other consonants, usually [k] or [g].

The Germans and Dutch confuse the voiceless and voiced plosives in final position. In initial position, the fact that they have a reversal of force strength on these sounds, causes their [p], [t], and [k], to resemble [b], [d], and [g], or *vice versa*.

The Austrians substitute a [p] for [b]. The Spanish tend to make it a fricative.

The Germans voice a [t]. The tongue-tip articulations of Romance peoples are more anterior than in English.

The Germans unvoice [d], as also, of course, do the Austrians. The Spanish tend to produce [d] as a fricative.

Some Chinese substitute [g] for [k], and [dʒ] for [g].

The [h] is pronounced by foreigners as [ʍ] in such words as [hu], [hum], and [hol]. This sound is lacking in many foreign languages, notably Spanish, French, and Italian.

The Germans and Swedes make the articulation contact for [l] too far posterior.

The sound of [ŋ] is followed by [g] in the brogues of Jews,

Germans, Frenchmen, Spaniards, Italians, and Chinamen. Sometimes this sound is combined with [k] into [ŋk]. The reason for the following of [k] or [g] behind the [ŋ] is not only found in the fact that many English words also add these sounds, viz., [fIŋgr], [θIŋk], etc., but also that the foreigner tends to explode [ŋ].

Our pronunciation of [r] is unique to the English language; as a result, practically all foreigners have a defective [r]. Neither the Japanese nor the Chinese have an [r]. The Chinese tend to substitute [l] for [r].

The [f] is difficult for the Japanese as is also the [v]. The Chinese have no [v], and tend to substitute [f] or [w] for it. The Germans substitute [f] for [v], as do some Austrians, although other Austrians substitute a bilabial fricative for [v], which also is common among the Spaniards.

The Jugo-Slavs, Czechs, Chinese, Germans, Austrians, Swedes, French, Italians, etc., have no [θ]. The Chinese often substitute [s], [d], or [ð] for [θ]. The Japanese substitute [t] or [s], as do many other nationalities.

Czechs, Jugo-Slavs, Germans, French, Chinese, and Italians, etc., have no [ð]. The Spanish, Chinese, Austrians, and Germans substitute [d] for [ð]. The Japanese substitute [d] for [z]. The Chinese substitute [z], as do many other nationalities.

The Spanish tend to precede initial [s] by the vowel [ɛ]. The Chinese and Japanese often substitute [ʃ] for [s].

Neither the Swedes nor the Chinese have a [z]. The Romance peoples, Germans, Austrians, Chinese, Russians, Spanish, and Jews substitute [s] for [z].

The Spanish, Chinese, and Swedes substitute [s] for [ʃ].

The Swedes and Spanish have no [ʒ]. The Chinese substitute [z] for [ʒ], the Germans, [ʃ] for [ʒ].

The Swedes, French, and Spanish have no [dʒ]. The French have no [tʃ]. The Swedes substitute [tj] for [tʃ].

The Chinese fail to move their jaws, or lips sufficiently to speak good English. The Japanese vowel movements are precise but the consonant movements are not. The Romance peoples move their lips, tongue, and jaws too energetically.

The Romance speaking peoples and Chinese explode all final consonants. The Germans, Chinese, Czechs, and Swedes unvoice final consonants. Many nationalities pronounce a vowel after final [l] in words such as [lɪtl], or [lɪtəl]. The Japanese end syllables only in vowels.

Many Europeans tend to give greater duration to the consonants than is the custom in English.

There are a number of characteristics of American speech, such as, the drawling slide-trombone type of pronunciation, diphthongization of vowels, careless or unstressed articulations, lazy lip and jaw movements, and unphonetic spelling, which add further difficulties to the student learning English as a secondary language.

The Chinese have considerable difficulty with English stress and intonation, because in Chinese the meaning is conveyed by variation in the pitch and pitch-patterns of individual words, and also by the fact that each syllable in Chinese is a word with its own accent. The French tend to stress the final syllables or final words in a sentence as they do in their native tongue. The Spanish usually stress the penult or ultimate syllable and tend to carry this habit over into their English pronunciation. The Italian difficulty lies in the fact that the Italian stress is not marked but usually falls on the next to the last syllable. The Germans give too great a stress to initial vowels, and usually precede them by a glottal stop. They also give too great a stress to unvoiced plosives and too little to voiced ones.

As a result of the social taboo in China against opening the mouth in public, the Chinese have great difficulty in pronouncing English sounds without nasality.

NASAL SPEECH

HATTIE J. E. SLATTENGREN
Albert Lea, (Minnesota) Public Schools

WE HAVE two opposed types of defective speech that we designate as nasal:

(a) Pathological deficiency of nasal resonance due to obstruction in the nasal passages resulting in "muffled," "stuffy," or "cold in the head" speech.

(b) Pathological excess of nasal resonance due to cleft palate or to the falling of the soft palate.

I wish to discuss the correction of the first class. When the obstruction, usually adenoids, is removed a child will often continue as if he had a severe head cold. To correct this, intensive and systematic retraining is necessary.

The sound units *m*, *n*, and *ng* are imperfectly resonated and form the basis of correction. The stream of air used to produce these

sounds, must be directed through the nose instead of through the mouth.

To aid this direction take a sheet of paper 9″ x 12″, crease lengthwise, and open. Roll small bits of paper for pellets. Seat the child in a chair and place the paper with creased fold and a pellet under the nose. Instruct the child to:

1. Inhale slowly using diaphragm.
2. Direct air through the nose and expel it by blowing pellet off the paper.

Stress the correct breathing and emphasize the consciousness of the air through the nasal cavity. Continue this exercise for five minutes and later use it at the beginning of each lesson. Use a notebook to show progress of decreased number of attempts necessary to blow pellets off. Increase the size of these gradually as lessons progress.

When the child has some success in directing the air through the nose, he is ready for sound combinations. Use following sound for vowel key:

[ɑ] as in saw
[eɪ] as in say
[i] as in see
[aɪ] as in sigh
[o] as in so
[u] as in sue

M, *n*, and *ng* and the vowels form the basis of continued therapy. Now we will use the above key with *m* and *n* initially, finally, and medially, and *ng* finally and medially.

Procedure: Taking the initial position of *m* first, we have: ma, meɪ, mi, maɪ, mo, mu. Place creased paper with pellet under the nose of the child. Direct child to:

1. Inhale using diaphragm.
2. Direct air through nose.
3. Expel air through nose simultaneously saying m with lips.
4. Complete word with vowel.

Score number of trials necessary before success is reached. Continue with this first combination until pellet leaves paper quickly through the force of air expelled before preceeding to the next vowel combination.

Emphasize the directing of the air through the nose while *m* is sounded before the vowel is added. Suggest that the child think of

the air direction. Do not hurry your pupil. He will need frequent rest periods so work slowly.

Proceed similarly with *n* in the initial position: na, neɪ, ni, naɪ, no, nu. Aim to blow pellet off paper at first trial while thinking *n* and before adding vowel.

Now refer back to *m* and add a consonant after the *m* and vowel combinations, thus: mab, meɪb, mib, maɪb, mob, mub. Work slowly and systematically keeping list of syllables used and score of successes. Always use creased paper and pellets for each combination. Do not work without this. Change final consonants, using: [b], [p], [d] ,[t], [g], [k], [v], [f], [ð], [θ], [s], [z], [ʃ], [j], [r], [l], [ʒ]. This will take many lessons of practicing and should not be hurried work.

The child is now ready for *n* initially. Proceed exactly as for *m*, i.e.: nab, neɪb, nib, naɪb, nob, nub. Add consonants listed for *m* and complete these combinations.

The pupil may now proceed to the final positions of *m*, *n*, and *ng*. Thus taking *m* first: am, eɪm, im, aɪm, om, um. Here the child says the vowel first and expels air and sounds *m* last. Practice this with creased sheet of paper and pellets as before until the pellet leaves the paper quickly.

Now begin each of these syllables with consonants previously listed adding [h] and [m], thus: bam, beɪm, bim, baɪm, bom, bum; dam, deɪm, dim, daɪm, dom, dum, etc. The child will expel air through the nose at the end of the word and will have to guard against using all of the breath for the first part of the word. It will take many lessons before the list of consonants is used.

Continue the procedure for *n* as: ban, beɪn, bin, baɪn, bon, bun using the consonants listed.

When *m* and *n* are well sounded initially and finally the child is ready for *ng* finally. Thus: aŋ, eɪŋ, iŋ, aɪŋ, oŋ, uŋ. Emphasize the thinking of the air being expelled through the nose and the thinking of sounding [ŋ] simultaneously. Add consonants initially as: baŋ, beɪŋ, biŋ, baɪŋ, boŋ, buŋ; daŋ, deɪŋ, diŋ, daɪŋ, doŋ, duŋ; kaŋ, keɪŋ, kiŋ, kaɪŋ, koŋ, kuŋ, etc.

Next present *m*, *n*, and *ng* medially, beginning with *m*, thus: ɑmɑ, eɪmeɪ, imi, aɪmaɪ, omo, umu. The child must remember to budget the air stream so that there will be an equal amount for the three parts *a*, *m*, *a*.

Proceed by adding consonants initially: bɑmɑ, beɪmeɪ, bimi baɪmaɪ, bomo, bumu. When each consonant is practiced initially, then

use each finally: ɑmɑb, eɪmeɪb, imib, aɪmaɪb, omob, umub; ɑmɑd, eɪmeɪd, imid, aɪmaɪd, omod, umud, etc.

Continue the procedure by adding the consonants initially and finally using studied consonant medially thus: bɑmɑb, beɪmeɪb, bimib, baɪmaɪb, bomob, bumub; dɑmɑd, etc.; kɑmɑk, etc. Repeat this therapy for *n* and *ng* working slowly and emphasizing the air directed through nasal cavity as *m, n,* or *ng* are given.

The practice of words may now be begun listing the initial *m, n,* the final *m, n, ng* and later the medial *m, n, ng* thus: *may, no, am, tan, sing, Tommy, Tony, ringer,* etc. The child can make his own list of these and add the combinations of *m, n,* and *ng* in the same word: *mingling, mansion,* etc.

Keep these points in mind while working with pupil:

1. Always use creased paper and pellets.
2. Work slowly.
3. Let the child rest often.
4. Stress the direction of air through the nasal cavity.
5. Always think of air proceeding from the nasal cavity while sounding *m, n,* and *ng*.

The results of this therapy depend upon:

1. The child's mentality.
2. The child's willingness to co-operate.
3. The age of the pupil.
4. The severity of the defect.
5. The length and frequency of the lessons.
6. The intensity of the training.

THE DISCUSSION CONTEST

EARL S. KALP
North High School, Des Moines

THERE is need in a democratic society for discussion. Sociologists, economists, and political scientists have been contending for some time that political and industrial democracy depend upon discussion for their continued existence and growth. Some large cities have provided public forums in order that citizens might have the opportunity to discuss local, national, and international problems. The forum method is being used in many secondary school classrooms throughout the nation. The discussion contest is a device that may be used to stimulate discussion in general, and is at the same

time an interesting, attractive and profitable extra-curricular activity.

There are three speech contests that help to promote discussion: namely, debate, extemporaneous speaking, and the discussion contest. Each is valuable, but the purpose of this brief article is to point out how the discussion contest differs from the other two and what may be expected in the discussion contest that is not present in debate or extemporaneous speaking.

Let us examine the difference between a debate and a discussion contest. In a debate there are usually two teams and two sides to the question, but there are many questions that have three, four or more sides. A discussion contest can be made to function better than a debate when questions with numerous phases are being considered. In discussing some questions, there is really a disadvantage in having "sides." The answer to many a complex question is not "yes" or "no," but "yes and no." But in a debate the attempt is made to prove that one side or the other is right or wrong. So in considering problems that are likely to end in compromise solutions, the method of calm, deliberate and non-argumentative discussion is preferable to a debate which often contains traces of partisanship, passion, and strategy. The motives of the student are likely to be different in a discussion contest. He is not attempting to prove something right or wrong and he is not trying to "put across" an idea or argument. His motive is to give those who listen, accurate, interesting, and unbiased information on a vital public question. He receives the decision of the judges because he made the most valuable contribution to the discussion and expressed himself most effectively. This type of contest makes it possible for the student to stand on middle ground when it is necessary instead of taking sides as a debater must.

It may seem, at first glance that the function of the discussion contest is pretty well taken care of by extemporaneous speaking contests, but there are differences that are vital. A very limited amount of time is given the student for immediate preparation of the talk to be presented in an extempore speaking contest. Unlimited time is available for the student who is planning to take part in a discussion contest. Some extemporaneous contests cover a wide range of subjects while a discussion contest would embrace only one problem.

The National Forensic League sponsored a discussion contest for teachers at its 1932 National Speech Tournament held in Sioux City, Iowa. The question discussed was, "Is democracy breaking down?" This was an interesting experiment. The main defect in the contest

was that it almost turned out to be a patriotic oratory contest. But the judges were in the main politicians and the coaches were merely adjusting themselves to the situation. This is however, a danger that needs to be guarded against in conducting discussion contests. Most certainly discussions should not be oratorical.

Three Iowa high schools experimented with the discussion contest during 1933. East High of Sioux City, Ames High School and North High of Des Moines conducted a radio discussion contest. Each school selected two speakers to discuss the question, "What can be done to further the cause of world peace?" The students participating were allowed to select any phase of the subject. Several weeks were given over to preparation. When the date of the contest arrived, the speakers representing the three schools went to their local radio stations to broadcast the discussion. One of the stations, WOI at Ames, picked up the program from Sioux City and the Des Moines station (KSO) and rebroadcast the entire program so that the public and the judges might listen without changing their radio dials. The judges gave individual decisions on the basis of effective presentation and the worthwhileness of the student's contribution to the discussion. To get the school's ranking the scores of the two contestants representing each school were averaged.

Ten years experience with speech contests has convinced the writer that there is merit in the discussion contest. It has a distinct place and definite function and does not necessarily overlap with debate and extempore speaking.

SOME NEW SPEECH ACTIVITIES

FRIEDA ROGATZKY
Norwood (Ohio) High School

THE following suggestions are the result of efforts to get rid of some of the bad results of contest activities and to educate the high school public to place emphasis upon speaking or reading for the pleasure derived rather than for a material reward.

Experimentation in high schools of various sizes has shown the feasibility and value of the organization of informal discussion and reading groups. The purpose of such groups is to give and receive pleasure by speaking or reading before an interested and friendly audience without any idea of reward except the gratification which would come from favorable criticism.

Beginning as an intramural activity these reading and discussion groups can become interscholastic within a city or a small radius of miles, but they should be considered successful only when the emphasis has been placed upon friendly participation and helpful criticism. It is to be hoped that such work as this will change the mind-set of speech pupils from prize-winning toward the participation for the sake of the work itself.

It must be remembered that however informal the groups may be in themselves, the most careful planning must be done for each meeting. This should include appointing a Chairman or Moderator, selecting two or three speakers to present the opening arguments on each side of the question to be debated and in the case of interpretative reading, planning for a variety of material so that the listeners, as well as participants, may grow in appreciation or skill as the case may be.

The second recommendation is in regard to the correlation of high school speakers with the current activities of the community through speakers bureaus.

In this work it is important that speakers should be listed in such Speakers Bureau only as they acquire enough skill to perform creditably to themselves and to their school. In this day when towns and cities are rife with luncheon clubs, women's clubs, and highly organized departmental work in churches, there ought to be many occasions when such organizations would be really interested in hearing pupil speakers and readers. The motivation for speech work in such cases is real and is conducive to the best possible performance on the part of the pupils. By bringing pupils in contact with life-situations, this plan offers a great incentive to the pupils and welds a real bond between the community and the school, a fact which is not to be disregarded in this day of frequent misunderstandings between the public and the schools.

DRAMATICS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS*

ROSE B. JOHNSON
Woodlawn High School, Birmingham, Alabama

DRAMATIC work in secondary schools, whether curricular or extra-curricular, should have the fundamental course in speech as a prerequisite. After the fundamental course we are faced with the question, "What then?" I offer you dramatics. Mr. Drummond says,[1] "Dramatics offers as good an opportunity as any" for training in speech. I offer it not as "good as any" but as an excellent way to teach speech and particularly as a follow-up of the fundamental course.

Let us divide dramatics in secondary schools into two phases: one is the extra-curricular phase, and the other the curricular. Every secondary school, whether large or small, should have a place for both, provided the school has a teacher who is trained to handle dramatics. By curricular dramatics I mean a class or classes in dramatics with regular periods in the school day. By extra-curricular dramatics I mean plays that are rehearsed after the regular school hours.

I know that there are those who will not agree with me about the extra-curricular plays. However, I do not see where there is time within school hours in our modern schools with all their wide variety of school subjects and activities for the rehearsal of a three, four, or five act play. That would take double periods, and few of our best pupils have the time for double dramatic periods. First, because not many of our colleges will give entrance credit for secondary school dramatics, and as a result the student must take those subjects which will give him credit for college entrance. There are other reasons, but this is sufficient.

Let us consider first the extra-curricular phase, bearing in mind that the principles which apply in one apply in both. Bear in mind, also, that extra-curricular plays should come after the fundamental course in speech and possibly (there are a few exceptions) after the regular course in dramatics.

Let us admit very frankly that production dramatics, which is usually the extra-curricular phase, are for the *gifted* student. And

* Presented at the New York Convention of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH, December, 1933. Here condensed.

[1] *Speech Training and Public Speaking for Secondary Schools*, Edited by A. M. Drummond, Page 230.

why shouldn't they be? We work more with the retarded pupil getting him to learn than with the gifted. Speech-defect pupils frequently come from below the average. There are special classes for the sub-normal child. Why shouldn't we have special work for the gifted? It is from this group that our leaders will come in a few years. A musical performance is given by those talented in music whether they have possibilities of being leaders or not. A football coach spends about twelve or more weeks on a football squad. We spend several weeks less on two plays which will have as many students as a football squad.

Granted that a play is to be given, let us consider the choice of play. In our dramatic program we should plan every variety of play. We can't give every kind in one year, but over a period of three or four years—the length of a pupil's stay in high school—we can give almost every type. All of our plays should not be the old classics, but they should be included in our program. Yes, sometimes we should have tragedy, sometimes farce, comedy, the historical play, the romantic, the poetical, and the melodramatic. Sometimes it may be the play of ideas, or the play of dialogue, or the play of character, or the play of plot. Whatever the type of play may be, it should be a *significant* play of its type with *literary merit*. Of course, it should be a play your students can act. This means of course that plays you can give at one time you couldn't give at others. You can't always find a boy who can play the lead in *The Passing of the Third Floor Back* or *Beau Brummel*. You must be guided in your selection by the ability of your students to "put the play across." If you give a series of plays you must build up an audience that will keep coming. Sometimes you might be able to slip a play over on your audience, but not often. Of course, you must consider the possibility of producing that play. Can you stage a play with three to seven changes in it without keeping your audience waiting too long? Or can you costume a historical play? Select a play that has a strong plot and much action or a play with strongly marked characters. Select a play in educational dramatics that will be the most helpful to the largest number. After all the school play is primarily for the purpose of education and incidentally for entertainment.

Avoid those plays whose emotion is beyond the comprehension of a high school pupil. Avoid the play of atmosphere, the *risqué*, or the questionable. Avoid or cut plays with suggestive scenes in them. Cut profanity from a high school play. You can always substitute something that is just as effective. Cut smoking on the stage for

high school youngsters, or at any rate use it only on rare occasions.

You do not have to play down to an audience. True, you can play over their heads, but both cast and audience will appreciate a good play. The audience of *The Passing of the Third Floor Back* liked it so much better than an ordinary little farce of two months before, and the cast of *The Dust of the Road* adored it. If you give them a cheap play some one will surely ask if that is the best you can do. Give your audience the best and, if they don't already, they will learn to appreciate it.

In your tryouts notify your group when the tryouts will be held. When they are assembled, whether they have read the play or not, discuss the characters with them and get each one to read several parts—as many as possible—rather than just for one part. Explain to them that possibly someone else is a better judge of what they are suited for. Discourage any attitude toward "if I can't have a certain part I won't have any." Show them that all parts are good. Then cast your play and try your group accordingly. This shows you their versatility, and avoids a person's being left out because he only tried for one part, and it gives you better talent for your smaller parts. Then your group usually knows who will get parts because of their good work and will be satisfied that no favoritism has been shown. Avoid type casting. Never give a part to a person whose speech may be hurt because of that part. Do not give a conceited or hateful part to a person of that type. Be sure these parts are assigned to people who are above reproach. Be sure the part does not hurt, but on the other hand that it will help the person.

When you have chosen your group, call them together and tell them just what it will mean to work in the play. Tell them when they will have to rehearse, and what they will have to give up for those rehearsals, when they must know their words, and that they must keep up with their regular school work. Explain your system, lay your cards on the table, and you will get co-operation from them, making it easier for you and for them.

If the student has to keep up with his regular school work and he should have to, to participate in a play, it will take five or six weeks to get that play ready. A good system is to require the words of Act I to be memorized at the end of the first week, Act II at the end of the second week, and Act III at the end of the third week.

Now you are ready to begin work. Right at the beginning should come the work on the characterization in the parts. See that they understand the kind of parts they are to play, but never let them

imitate you. Have each work out his own characterization. Give each person the help that will develop him most in characterization, in interpretation of lines, in bodily action, in voice, in speech. For three or four weeks work for the thing that will be most helpful to the cast as a whole and to the individuals. The last two weeks get the play ready for public performance. If the two clash, give the cast the thing that is most helpful to them.

To educate the person—to bring him out—dare a secondary school director take liberties with the play? Here am I, a high school teacher with no pretense of being able to write a play—even a very poor playwright could beat me. Dare I take liberties with a dramatist? Yes, often I've changed a line to make it grammatical. I have been known to change a dialect part to straight smooth English, and it didn't hurt the play. Change the play as written? Indeed, no! But certain parts—as I would cut—I would change unhesitatingly if it would help the person. Having worked two-thirds of the time to train the individual to get the characterization, to train him in speech, and so on, I spend the last one-third of the time trying to make as smooth a performance for the public as possible. And so one can have good educational dramatics as well as a reasonably smooth public performance.

We hear much about the wise use of leisure time. The play is one of the solutions of this problem for both the actor and audience. Participating in a play teaches the pupil to respect the property of others and to take care of it, for few things with which he has to work are his. It teaches him to depend on himself, for when the curtain goes up he has only himself to depend on to "put his part across," and to help make the play a success by being prepared for any situation that may arise. It teaches him the value of work, because a well presented play requires both mental and physical work.

Above all, participation in a play and seeing a good play has more influence on the molding of character than possibly any other single thing. We, in America, sometimes forget the influence of the acted play, but Russia has not forgotten it, nor did the early church forget it. More and more the church today is recognizing its influence. If reading literature helps mold character, how much more will actual participating in a play mold it? One's sympathies are developed for all sorts and conditions of men. We see and learn to understand people, whether it be the beggar on the streets or the prince on the throne, the business man of sound principles, or the business man of unsound principles, "rich man, poor man, beggar man, thief, doctor,

lawyer, Indian chief," whether it be our own times, or times whose glory is no more.

To turn to curricular dramatics—all that has been said of extra-curricular dramatics is true of curricular dramatics. A school *should* offer curricular dramatics. Here one has the opportunity to work with the one and two act play or the play running an hour or a little more. One has the opportunity to train some that would not have the privilege of appearing in production dramatics. However, some of these people may on occasions appear for certain parts. (The best piece of high school work I ever saw was by a boy taking the part of Tuck in *Robin Hood*. His size would have prevented his taking many parts.)

I agree with Mr. A. M. Drummond in his article on "Dramatics and Speech Training,"[2] when he said:

> Staging, costuming, lighting, and stage decorations are not speech training. They are always desirable and often necessary for satisfactory theatrical effects. But the fascination of stage craft should never divert the attention of the director of educational dramatics from his prime objective which is to train the interpretative and expressive faculties of the individual through the adequate expression by voice and action of the dramatic values of significant plays of literary merit.

Therefore the major portion of the time in the curricular dramatics course should be spent in the study of drama and the interpretation of it. Just how that is to be worked out will depend on the particular teacher as well as the problem in each school. However, the course should include the study of the voice, pantomimic action, an understanding of the play, and an attempt to express the play by voice and action. The course should include some appreciation of costuming, make-up, stage setting, etc., but the study of the play and the interpretation of it should constitute the most of the study in high school, leaving the accessories to colleges and universities. When one has time it should be spent in reading, study, and analysis of other plays that may not be presented.

With all the work, with all the worry, with all the infinite pains it takes, with all the lack of co-operation, with all the lack of appreciation, with all the grey hairs it brings, with all the lines it leaves on one's brow, there is a pleasure and a satisfaction of creative work that this infectious, contagious, and vicious disease of teaching dramatics leaves. And may the fun and joy and love outlive the worry,

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 232.

and the pain, and the grey hairs. And may we begin each new play with the same zest and enthusiasm of a new opportunity to train, develop, and give pleasure to each succeeding cast that comes our way.

SPEECH IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

LETITIA RAUBICHECK
New York City Public Schools

IN presenting a plan for a unified course of study in speech for the elementary school, it is neecessary first to determine what outcomes should be desired. I conceive them to be, in general, along two lines. First, to give to the child a speech pattern which will be an efficient tool for self-expression and for group adjustment; and second, to give to the pupil sufficient facility and power in the use of language to enable him to fulfill adequately those civic, economic, and social activities which are participated in by the average citizen.

In order to understand clearly what these objectives signify, perhaps it would be helpful to define certain of the terms. *Speech pattern* will be taken to include voice, pronunciation, and intonation. The *voice* to be achieved should be loud enough to be heard with ease in conversational situations and should be pleasant enough to arouse a favorable reaction. *Pronunciation* should consist of a dialect which is devoid of those vulgar, foreign, or sectional deviations which, in Professor Krapp's phrase, "result in economic or social penalty." The desideratum should be a unified, sincere, and appropriate dialect which serves as a medium for expression and calls a minimum of attention to itself. Finally, the *intonation* should be one which does not attract unfavorable attention through being foreign, artificial, or vulgar. By *facility and power* one would mean first, the ability to make one's meaning clear; and second, the ability to influence favorable action through the use of spoken language.

The situations which may be participated in by the average citizen include informal and formal conversations, after-dinner speeches, sales reports, inquiries, and such. The attempt should be not to give specific technique for special situations, but to show the student how to find the fundamental principles of good approach to any speech situation.

SUGGESTED GRADING OF OBJECTIVES FOR EIGHT YEARS OF SPEECH WORK

(*Note:* The objectives listed here should be considered as points of emphasis only. An effort should be made to obtain mastery of each phase of the work as a minimum essential.)

First Year: Ability to produce correctly all the sounds of English in isolation, in simple words, and in prepared communication such as oral reading, memory selections, and oral composition.

Second Year: Correct use of strong and weak forms. Mastery of the double and treble consonant combinations such as "pl" and "str." At the end of this year all baby talk and infantile non-organic lisping should be removed.

Third Year: Intonation. At the end of this year noticeable foreign and vulgar deviations should have been eliminated.

Fourth Year: Stress groups and breath groups. At the end of this year the speech pattern should be set. Only incidental corrective work should be needed on the formal side hereafter.

Fifth Year: Review of sounds as need arises. Mastery of the correct sounds in free speech. Attention to the thoughtful reading of poetry with special practice in stress and emphasis.

Sixth Year: Special emphasis on modulation in voice. The original speech, narrative form, should be the basis for the major part of the practice.

Seventh Year: Emphasis on exposition. Selection of detail and arrangement of material with respect to audience.

Eighth Year: A brief but comprehensive review of all the sounds of English with special drill upon any weak spots. Since the voices of some of the boys are changing, instruction in the economical use of the voice with direct reference to the pupil's problem should be included in the formal work. Persuasive speech should be stressed.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A WEEKLY PLAN

This plan is to be followed for the first year in the establishment of correct pattern, particularly in the sound of English:

Objectives: I. Formation of a habit of pleasant voice and adequate speech.

II. Mastery of the sound—steps.

1. Correct production in isolation.
2. Correct production in words in which it occurs.
3. Correct production in phrases.
4. Correct production in sentences and prepared discourse—reading, oral composition, memory selections.
5. Habitual use of the correct sound in free speech.

Means: I. Daily breathing, relaxation, voice and articulation drills.

(3 minutes.)

II. *Monday*—Production of sound in isolation.

1. Presentation of the sound in familiar words, culled from conversation, reading, content subject matter. Words written on the board, sound discovered and isolated.

2. Sound repeated by imitation of teacher's model.
3. Sound analyzed.
4. Sound associated with a picture and key word. "s" is the first sound in "sail."
5. Sound associated with its phonetic symbol. (Optional but recommended.)

(7 minutes.)

Tuesday—Objective: Production of sound in words.

1. Review sound, production, key word, and (optional) phonetic symbol.
2. Class suggests words in which sound occurs initially, medially, finally. These are written on board. They should be words which occur either in conversation or in class recitation. If there is a variety of spellings (f, ph, for example) those should be included.
3. Each student might be instructed to list in his speech book five words containing the sound in each position.

(7 minutes.)

Wednesday—Objective: Production of sound in phrases and sentences.

The articulation drill for the day should include phrases containing the sound (safe and sane; sound and sense; etc., etc.).

(7 minutes.)

Thursday—Assimilation of correct use of sound in prepared discourse.

This may take the form of listing the words in the reading lesson or "memory gem" which contain the sound.

They may be practised first in isolation, then set in their context.

(7 minutes.)

Friday—This day should be devoted to individualized speech work. The students who have mastered the week's sound and who have no outstanding difficulty might engage in some or all of the following exercises:

1. Making a speech notebook. A single page is to be devoted to each sound. A picture clipped from a magazine illustrates the sound.
2. (optional) The phonetic symbol is placed beneath the picture.
3. A list of words, used by the class during the week is grouped according to position of the sound.
4. Some of the practice sentences—original, or those composed by the class—may be entered also.

Those students who are having particular difficulty may be given special help, either by the teacher or by a student leader.

Every student should keep a list of words with which he has had difficulty and these lists may be used as the

basis for individual or group review on the Friday program.

Any child who suffers from a defect such as nasality or lisping may receive special help at this time.

(7 minutes.)

Conclusion

If a definite time for the establishment of a good speech pattern is set up as an important part of the school curriculum, and if the specific work done in the speech period is consistently carried through the other activities of the child's life; if speech is made not a parlor exhibition but the bread and butter of ordinary communication, and finally, if there is a progressive and graded course of study intelligently carried out by adequately prepared teachers, the speech habits of the elementary school child will be such as to remove from American education the stigma so often placed upon it, that we fit our children for technical aspects of life, but omit the social powers which make it possible for them to use technical skills. This type of speech program would fit well in the new activities program which aims to fit the whole child to live more abundantly in the new life.

A SPEECH PROGRAM IN A SMALL SCHOOL SYSTEM*

J. DALE WELSCH

Elkader, Iowa, Public Schools

THE weakness of our present method of teaching speech to students of the public school became clear to members of our faculty after the tabulation of the results produced by a survey of our high school; a high school which was the recipient of speech honors above the average even among larger secondary schools. This survey showed conclusively that among 100 cases we had 36 with faulty rhythm, 28 with some organic defect, particularly of the teeth, 72 with a more or less degree of severity in oral inaccuracy, 75 with a poor "s" sound, 62 deficient in "z," 52 minus a breathed "w," 86 with a terrible "a," 34 with an extremely weak "t." Other portions of the survey were just as striking. Upon delving into the grades we

* This program is not presented as a model program. It is suggestive. It is a solution to the problem faced by one small elementary school organization.

found a like situation, in some instances much worse. In order to eliminate 14% defective, 20% very poor, 31% poor, with but 13% more than satisfactory, we began to plan a speech course based upon such conditions, which we learned existed not only in our school but in others as well.

In the beginning we listed our reasons for making such a move. We decided that the construction of a course of study should be begun for the small school system of Elkader, first because speech is so fundamental in its value to the business and social interests of men and women that infinite training should be provided during the formative and plastic years in the grades; second, because the courses of study prevalent in the high school and colleges do not establish adequate speech habits; third, because the extra-curricular endeavors of high schools and colleges do not reach the great average mass of students; and finally, because Oral English does not meet the demands of the situation sufficiently. Therefore, Oral English, as a curricular subject, was abandoned and in its place a speech program was evolved.

This idea was instituted as a part of the Language or English course introduced two days per week throughout the year in the kindergarten, three days in the primaries and fourth grade, two and one half days in the fifth, one and one half days in the sixth, and one day in each of the seventh, eighth and other grades of the high school and junior college.

Speech as now temporarily established is divided in each grade into three general divisions—*speech correction*, which includes problems of speech formation, rhythm, phonetics, oral inaccuracy, and organic defects, as well as voice and voice control; *performance*, which provides means of drill and growth in skill; and *symbolic formulation and expression*, which fills the need for any Oral English as such. Each grade is tested for hearing, sight, organic defects, proper articulatory construction, and the absence of any speech sounds. A progressive history of each child will have been developed before the year is completed.

With this general explanation in mind, you may be interested in a more specific outline of the work as being built for each grade. Therefore I have requested those instructors in charge of each department of the grade school to make such a summary, as well as to present types of lesson plans used. May you bear in mind that this is just a beginning, that we are experimenting, that results as yet are far from definite.

Our outline is experimental, one which we hope to build upon

after obtaining sufficient information. There are several problems confronting us still:

(1) How shall we word the various parts of our program so as to be suitable for the age levels of the children?
(2) How shall we measure oral vocabulary per grade?
(3) What shall be the minimum speech essentials per grade?
(4) How soon can we complete a speech guide for the teachers to use in other subjects?

KINDERGARTEN AND FIRST GRADE

(Gladys E. Price, Teacher)

I. Kindergarten:
  A. Speech Correction:
    1. Picture test to determine the defect in speech sounds.
    2. Individual record, showing the defects of each child.
    3. Organic examination, to determine defective teeth, tonsils, general condition of oral and nasal passages.
    4. Drill on correcting defective sounds revealed by test.
    5. To teach the phonetic alphabet symbols for speech sounds.
    6. To drill on pitch and flexibility.
  B. Performance:
    1. Story reproduction.
    2. Story dramatization.
    3. Programs.
    4. Memorization of poems.
    5. Oral talks on subjects of interest to kindergarten children.

II. First Grade.
  A. Speech Correction:
    1. Picture test.
    2. Revision of individual records.
    3. Organic examination.
    4. Drill on correcting defective sounds.
    5. Teach the phonetic alphabet symbols for speech sounds.
    6. Drill on pitch and flexibility.
    7. Retest for improvement.
  B. Performance:
    1. Story reproduction.
    2. Story dramatization.
    3. Programs.
    4. Appreciation of poems.
    5. Composition of original poems and stories.
    6. Talks on subjects of interest to first grade children.
  C. Symbolic Formulation and Expression.
    1. Elimination of incorrect verb forms as *come* for *came*—*seen* for *saw*—*run* for *ran*—*ain't* for *am not, are not, is not, aren't* and *isn't*.
    2. Correct use of above verb forms using *have, has,* and *had.*
    3. Correct use of *me* and *I*—*may* and *can.*

4. To learn to use a complete sentence.
5. Emphasis on clear articulation.
6. To increase the vocabulary.

Second and Third Grades
(Celia Clemens, Teacher)

The week's English schedule is divided into three speech days and two days of literature. One of the speech days each week is given over entirely to the correction of speech sounds tending toward clear articulation, pronunciation and enunciation. Each child having faulty speech will be given a thorough examination to ascertain an organic difficulty—if any. Dentists co-operate with the school in giving each child a free dental examination. Parents are then urged to see that the necessary dental work is done. The child is also tested at the beginning of the year to discover any auditory or visual deficiencies. Phonetic sounds, with symbols, are to be taught the latter part of the year.

The attention is given to Performance the second speech day. This time is taken up with talks, discussions, dramatizations, parliamentary activities, programs, creative poems and stories, reports and story telling.

The other speech day we use for Symbolic Formulation and Expression. Here we work on English correctness; oral grammar; and vocabulary.

Speech training is not limited to its regular period but is constantly kept before the children. For example, every child is required to stand when reciting in order that the habit of speaking on his feet will be established early, to speak clearly, to make complete sentences, and to address the teacher and other children by their names.

Grades Four, Five, and Six
(Helen M. Truman, Supervisor)

Grade Four

I. Correction.
   - A. The first six weeks are spent in diagnosing speech defects by means of a chart containing standardized sentences, checking on ability in speech making and the ability to read aloud.
   - B. Review of common speech sounds.
   - C. Organic examination of ears, eyes, oral and nasal cavities.
   - D. Rhythm.
   - E. Oral accuracy.
   - F. Voice; Pitch; Flexibility; Intensity; Duration.

II. Performance—one day a week.
   - A. In performance, real audience situations are provided, thereby training the child for speech needs he may encounter in real life.
   - B. Posture and bodily movement.
   - C. Parliamentary drill: names and number of officers, duties of each, how to make a motion and nomination. The class learns to conduct a meeting.
   - D. Talks are studied in detail; each child gives at least two.
   - E. Programs.
     The class is divided into groups and each group plans a program to be given in an assembly.
   - F. Story Telling.

G. Oral Reading of prose. Special attention is given to word and thought grouping.
H. Reading of poetry.
I. Pantomiming.
J. Dramatization.

GRADE FIVE

I. Correction—one day a week.
A. Diagnosis.
There is a progression. The progression, however, is not in the method, but in the development of the child. Those habits correctly established are merely checked. Emphasis is placed upon improvement of deficiencies.
B. Review of Sounds.
C. Organic examination.
D. Rhythm.
E. Oral accuracy.

II. Performance.
A. Parliamentary drill; new points are added as needed.
B. Speech making; discussion of choice of material and subject; practice in giving speeches.
C. Programs.
D. Discussion of topics children choose.
E. Conversation; the class is divided into groups to carry on conversation of interest to all members of the group.
F. Reading of prose.
G. Reading of poems.
H. Pantomiming.
I. Dramatization; a playlet is worked out from a story that has been read.

GRADE SIX

I. Correction and Performance.
In grade six we have combined correction and performance because we have found that the work can be covered in less time due to the development which has been made in previous grades.
A. Six weeks are devoted to diagnosing the sounds, voice, speech, speech making and reading to determine what remains to be stressed in this grade.
B. Review of speech sounds and phonetic alphabet.
C. Organic examination.
D. Parliamentary drill.
All the work for preceding grades is reviewed and a question for discussion is given.
E. Speeches are studied more in detail; introduction, purpose, body, conclusion. A child gives each part separately then finally produces a speech as a whole.
F. Programs.
G. Debating. The class learns the organization of a speech, the place of main speeches and rebuttal, refutation.

H. Reading of prose. Special attention is given to grouping, subordination, recreation of author's thought and feeling.
I. Reading of poetry; for appreciation of the whole and of parts.
J. Impersonation; as progression from pantomiming.
K. Dramatization. In this grade the children write and perform their own plays.

Lesson Plans

These sample lesson plans show some of the procedures used in our speech training program.

Kindergarten and First Grade

Topic—Speech Correction.
Assignment—To learn to give the correct sound of *p*.
Aim—To encourage the children to hear and use the correct sound of *p*.
Procedure—Show pictures containing sound. Ask the children to listen and repeat after the instructor nonsense syllables as—pa, pe, pi, pu, po, —ap, ip, op, ep, up,—apa, ipi, opo, epe, etc. Sentences and word, phonetic symbol, stimulation method.
Material—Words and pictures:

Pan, pen, apple, cap, lap, map, lamp.

Sentences:

Peter and Peggy ate apples and pumpkin pie.
Patty heard the woodpecker say tap, tap, tap.
Did Paul spill the pop?

Kindergarten

Topic—Performance.
Assignment—To dramatize story: "Three Billy Goats Gruff."
Aim—To give experience in impersonating characters in a story.
Procedure—The children should be familiar with the story. Discuss with the children parts of the story such as: what each Billy Goat said, how each would say it, what the Troll looked like, how he would speak. Let the children plan the dramatization by choosing the character and place to dramatize the story.
Material—Properties the children choose to make the story more real.

First Grade

Topic—Symbolic Formulation and Expression.
Assignment—To add new words to the children's vocabulary.
Aim—To develop an interest in words and to encourage the children to add new words to their vocabulary.
Procedure—Children name the objects in the room as the teacher writes them on the board.

Play games that will stimulate the children to learn the words.

Third Grade

Topic—Book Reports.
Aim—To tell the story of the book read in an interesting manner. To give the main points of the story consecutively. To interest the class in reading the book.

(These children have previously had organization of talks and sufficient

practice in planning them so that this lesson is a check on organization as well as projection. The book reports will be given with an introduction, three main points and a concluding statement.)

Procedure—Each child is asked to read a book and to tell the story to the class. The child should know the title and author of his book. Giving these reports before a class provides a true audience situation for the children.

Materials—Some books that the children like:

Little Joe Otter.....Thornton Burgess
Book of Nah Wee.....Moon and Moon
Jean and Jerry's Vacation.....Johnson
Judy's Ocean Voyage.....Bernstein
Skags, the Milk Horse.....Huber
Friends of Eskimo Land.....Carpenter

Second and Third—Speech Correction

Topic—Distinction of *w* and *wh*.

Aim—To help the child know when he is saying *w* and *wh* correctly and to encourage him to continue saying the sounds correctly in words.

Procedure—To get the sound of *w*, tell what the little pig says.

Wee, wee, wee.

To get the sound of *wh*, tell what you say to stop a horse.

Whoa, whoa.

Hold a piece of paper before your face when giving the sounds: *w* will not move the paper; *wh* will cause the paper to vibrate. Have the child repeat after you nonsense syllables such as wha, who, whu, whe-wa, we, wo, wu.

Think of words containing the sound *wh*. The same with *w*. If the child pronounces the words incorrectly have him watch while the teacher pronounces the word five times, then try again. Give him other words to pronounce.

Have him read sentences containing words having these sounds.

Materials—Words on Cards—

whip, whistle, whisper, white.
willow, will, was, water.

Sentences on Cards—

What white walls.
Whistle when you want me.
Where will we go?

Second Grade—Symbolic Formulation and Expression

Topic—Enlarging the Vocabulary—Word Opposites.

Aim—To develop and enlarge the speaking vocabulary.

Procedure—Explain the meaning of opposite.

Illustrate by asking what is opposite from hot (cold).

Teacher mentions a word and asks the child for a word meaning just the opposite. Other children mention words.

List words and their opposites on the board. Children pick out the words which are opposite to one another.

To impress the words further upon the child write sentences on the board and let him fill in the blanks orally.

Materials—Word List:

bad	cold
early	long
hot	good
short	late
wet	work
play	sour
sweet	dry
little	white
black	big

Sentences:

1. Fire is hot but ice is .....
2. Candy is ..... but lemons are sour.
3. Snow is white but coal is .....
4. Flies are small; elephants are .....
5. I went to school early but John is .....
6. Mary has an old coat. Jack's coat is .....
7. This lesson is easy. The other lesson was .....

Fourth Grade

Topic—Performance—Assembly Program.

Pupil's Aim—To construct and produce an assembly program.

Teacher's Aim—To check ability of each student in organization and presentation to his audience of the particular unit of a program which he uses.

Procedure—The class names the days in February for which programs could be planned.

Suggestions from the class as to source of material.

Discuss what constitutes a well balanced program.

In order that the class understand the form of arrangement a sample is put on the board as the class suggests the numbers.

The class is divided into two groups, each with a chairman, which meet and decide the event for which they wish to plan a program.

For the follow-up assignment each group brings to class a variety of suitable program material.

In class they meet, arrange the program—assign individual and group parts.

Sixth Grade

Topic—Symbolic Formulation and Expression—Variety in Sentence Form.

Aim—To teach the children to use variety in oral sentence form.

Procedure—Review declarative, imperative, exclamatory and interrogative sentences.

Give oral examples and recognize any one of these sentences in a paragraph.

Variety in bodily movement, facial expression, vocal pitch and inflection suitable for each type of thought.

In the follow-up assignment each child gives a talk in which he uses the above sentences.

THE FORUM

EXTEMPORE SPEAKING IN SAN DIEGO

For many years the author has beeen vainly seeking a system which would lend more vitality to extempore speaking contests. Those in charge of the preparations for such contests are ever steering their course between the Scylla of too complete fore-knowledge of the subject and the Charybdis of a complete lack of acquaintance with the topic involved. At many institutions, the contestants are completely in the dark as to what their subject will be until an hour previous to the contest, at which time they are given their subject, loosed in a library and allowed to prepare their speeches. Of course, this is feasible only where the contest is intramural, because otherwise the home team has the decided advantage of knowing where to find the most likely books. In other cases, the students are first made acquainted with their topic upon the platform, and the resulting scene is often pitiable.

In San Diego county, where three schools which are active in all types of public speaking have established chapters of the National Forensic League, we agreed that what we needed was a type of extempore contest which would operate in such a manner as to give the participating students of all three schools a reasonable inkling of what they might expect, but without their having the opportunity to prepare substantially until they reached the platform.

Briefly, each school enters three contestants. (N.F.L. chapters cannot receive credit points for the participation in any contest of more than three students from any one school.) If three schools compete, this gives a total of nine students competing. The school which has furthest to travel is assigned the more favorable speaking positions in the contest, which have been determined to be third, sixth and ninth. The home team takes first, fourth, and seventh positions, the remaining positions being assigned to the other school.

A main topic is agreed upon, such as "America's Future." This is readily susceptible of division into from nine to eleven sub-topics (two extra sub-topics may be used to make the mathematical chances of guessing what topic the individual student will draw even less possible). We thus have such sub-topics as The Political Future of

America, The Social Future of America, The Religious Future of America, The Economic Future of America, The Literary Future of America, The Musical Future of America, The Agricultural Future of America, the Recreational Future of America, etc. Other subtopics will readily suggest themselves.

In this way, each speaker knows that he will be called upon to discuss one of these topics and can prepare in such a way that his talk will not prove too lame and halting, and yet he will find it exceedingly difficult to prepare fully on all the topics.

Four minutes before the first student begins to speak, he chooses his topic by lot from cards held face down by the chairman, and after showing his selection to the chairman, he is then allowed four minutes to collect his thoughts, and before the chairman introduces him to the audience, the second speaker is permitted to select his topic in the same fashion.

Each speaker must speak for three minutes and may not speak for a longer period than four minutes. The customary warnings are given. The resulting program can be compressed into a 45-minute assembly or class period.

A further development is possible by using such a main topic as "What would one of the famous Americans of the past do if placed in a position of responsibility today and faced with modern problems?" By choosing nine modern problems such as Crime, Unemployment, Currency Control, Centralization of Federal Power, Veterans Relief, Liquor Control, Education, National Defense and Foreign Affairs; and also nine famous Americans of the past such as Washington, Lincoln, Hamilton, Lee, Theodore Roosevelt, Jefferson, Grant, Webster and Franklin; and asking each speaker to select one card from each group (the cards used may be of two contrasting colors); the possibility of preparing a speech beforehand is reduced almost to nil.

Such interesting combinations might result as "How would Hamilton deal with the currency?" or "What would Lincoln's attitude be toward veterans' relief?" or "What would Theodore Roosevelt do to check crime?" The variations can be mathematically computed, but they defy attempts to prepare a complete speech, while permitting the previous acquisition of a fund of information which thought and ingenuity can turn into an interesting speech.

We have found the audience reaction to this type of contest splendid, and the contestants prefer them as being nearer to what is demanded of them in actual life.

RICHARD N. THOMPSON
San Diego Army and Navy Academy

NEW BOOKS

Suggestions in Speech Improvement. New York: Board of Education, 1933; pp. 54. *The Jingle Book for Speech Correction.* By ALICE L. WOOD. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1934; pp. lxxi + 115. *Graded Objectives for Teaching Good American Speech.* By E. A. DOURIS, K. L. O'CONNELL, G. PROUDMAN, A. BOERS, H. R. DALTON, F. E. DANIELS, J. I. MALLOY, S. A. PADLEY, and S. A. PRAY. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1934; pp. 90.

The problem of speech improvement in the schools of New York City is difficult and complicated, and it is to the credit of Mrs. Raubicheck and her associates in the Bureau of Speech Improvement that they are attacking the problem vigorously. The types of speech heard in the metropolitan district of New York, an indefinite area embracing suburbs on Long Island, in Westchester and Rockland counties, and in adjacent districts of New Jersey and Connecticut, spring from many sources. Historically, New York City has a variety of Eastern American speech, but a variety distinct from those in nearby New England. To the north, the metropolitan district fades into the upstate region, where a modified form of General American speech is spoken. As in the case of all linguistic border areas, there is much intermingling of the various regional influences.

Nor is this all; for decades New York has been the center of that vast, inchoate ferment known as the melting pot, and every schoolboy knows such elementary bits of information as that there are more Greeks in New York than in Athens. To a large degree these foreign elements tend, by forming social and linguistic colonies within the city, to retard the acquisition, among their members, of American ways and American speech. Particularly is this true of the Russian Jews who form so large a part of the city's population. This Jewish population has well established speech habits of its own; it has its own social and cultural facilities; and the acquisition of American speech, free from any foreign tinge, is not easy. In varying degrees the same conditions are true among the other groups with the background of a foreign language.

Finally, the centralizing of the American stage on Broadway has added slightly to the confusion of tongues by introducing yet another

linguistic type, a type stemming ultimately from the theatres of London, and kept flourishing at once by American theatrical folk who have acquired it, and by frequent importation of actors from London. This type of speech exerts an influence disproportionate to the number of people who use it because of the social prestige with which they have succeeded in investing it.

Such is the situation in which the public school teacher in New York City finds himself. Among his students will be Russian Jews, Italians, and others whose speech proclaims their foreign heritage. There will be "Americans," descendants of earlier immigrants, and they will have various geographic, social, and cultural backgrounds. There may be a few who have been influenced by the traditions of stage speech, though, despite the popularity of elocution schools, they are likely to be rare in the lower grades.

In such a situation the inquiring teacher might see various possibilities for improvement. Native Americans might be encouraged to improve their speech within the framework of whichever regional type they knew best, though such a variety of standards might prove unmanageable in classroom procedure. Simpler would be to make the type spoken by the native majority the pedagogic norm, and work for improvement within the limits of this type. On the basis of such a decision, either the general Eastern type, which is locally dominant, or the General American type, which is nationally dominant, might have been chosen; in either case a large number of students could improve their speech without needing to learn a wholly new dialect. It is highly unfortunate that the Board of Education and the Bureau of Speech Improvement did not make such a decision.

Instead, they decided that the pedagogic standard was to be "standard English," a term used by its devotees to designate the dialect spoken by a fairly good portion of Englishmen educated in the southern part of England, and having a limited currency in other parts of the English-speaking world, including a limited use on the American stage. In the north of England, in Scotland and Ireland, the southern British dialect is not regarded as "the" standard. Natives of South Africa and Australia assure me that the Englishman is conspicuous by his speech in their Dominions. In Canada and the United States the dialect is always felt to be alien. With the exception of Wyld and, possibly, Ripman, English-speaking phoneticians of the first rank do not accept the southern British dialect as "the" standard, and most of them refuse to dignify it with the name of standard. Jones, in London, calls it "received pronunciation" or

"public school speech," and regards it merely as one among many. No first-rank American phonetician accepts it is a standard for American use. So far as I am aware, nowhere in the English-speaking world does any school board attempt to impose the dialect on its teachers and students outside of southern England and New York City.

The three books under review throw a good deal of light on the attempt of the New York City authorities to accomplish this purpose. All three have official backing of one sort or another. All aim to give methods and aims for the improvement of speech within the limits of the southern British dialect. All make use of Mr. Tilly's phonetic alphabet, which is based on the alphabet of the International Phonetic Association, though not identical with it.

Suggestions in Speech Improvement, designed "for the Use of Classroom Teachers," is an official pamphlet of the Bureau of Speech Improvement. The Foreword is signed by Leontine Murtha, Chairman of the Committee on Speech Suggestions, and by Letitia Raubicheck, Director of Speech Improvement. Whether they alone, or the committee as a whole, are responsible for the contents of the pamphlet is not stated. The pamphlet begins with exercises for relaxation, breathing, voice production, and articulation; passes on to a series of lessons in the pronunciation of English consonants, vowels, and diphthongs, some of which are taken from Birmingham and Krapp's *First Lessons in Speech Improvement;* and concludes with suggestions and outlines for the conduct of lessons and projects in speech improvement. There is a bibliography, but no index.

Graded Objectives is a more ambitious work. In addition to its nine authors, it lists three consultants and six endorsers, all of whom have been associated at one time or another with schools and colleges in New York City. The book presents a series of units, worked out in painstaking detail, for the guidance of the teacher of speech improvement. If teachers adhere to these units, the student can doubtless be transferred from one teacher to another with a minimum of wasted and overlapping effort. The book attempts to set up, in short, a standardized curriculum to bring some sort of order to the chaotic state of speech improvement, and all teachers of speech will applaud this objective. The book also has a bibliography, but no index. Much of the material in these two books is the same. *Suggestions in Speech Improvement* is more general in methodology; *Graded Objectives* is more closely confined to curricular problems.

The Jingle Book, as its name implies, differs considerably from

the others. Though the first third deals with principles and methods, the greater part consists of a series of jingling rhymes, each designed to emphasize and give practice in the pronunciation of a single sound unit. More noticeably than in the other books, the author's aim is motivation; for this purpose, the jingles are admirably done, and the teacher should find little difficulty in maintaining the interest of younger children. The section on phonetic principles is clearly set forth, and though the pages dealing with "ng" trouble and stammering are probably too few to be of much service, the section is adequate. The book has neither bibliography nor index, but their omission is not so serious in one designed for young children. In the choice of standard, this book is the least objectionable. Though the British standard is accepted, neither it nor the Tilly symbols are emphasized, and it is quite possible that the author is merely giving lip service to the doctrines of the Bureau. The teacher who does not accept the British standard will nevertheless find the book extremely useful.

Even if one grants the Bureau's major premise about "the" standard, there are still objections to the phonetic principles enunciated in these books. The alphabet is needlessly complicated, cluttered with diacritical markings which tend to become, in the hands of all save the expert, symbols of orthodoxy rather than of observed variations. The recorded variations within the "short i" phoneme, for example, show, in *Graded Objectives*, an uncertainty on the part of the authors; the subordinate members of this phoneme, particularly in unstressed positions, are different in England and America, but those shown here do not agree with usage in either country. Similarly, there is uncertainty as to the inclusion of [t] in such words as *lunch* and *inch*. From the British point of view the most objectionable feature, shared by all three books, would be, I suppose, the recording of the American diphthongs in *how* and *go*, and the American voiceless consonant in *why*. If these are standard pronunciations, then the English of London is not standard. The explanation is probably that the British equivalents of these sounds have always been regarded as so undesirable in this country that not even the standardizers were willing to urge their adoption. The "broad a" is of course present in all three books: enforced in *ask*, in which very few Americans use it, and rejected in *hot*, in which practically all Americans habitually do use it. *Suggestions in Speech Improvement*, to be sure, allows the intermediate New England vowel in *ask*, but not the normal "flat a." This insistence on changing from one good pronunciation to another frequently results in a net loss to good speech; the

student who has broadened his "a" in *ask* also broadens it in *land;* many who have acquired the British "short o" in *hot* get into the habit of using it in *heart* as well.

The bibliographies are symptomatic of the trend of the two books in which they are included. *Suggestions in Speech Improvement* lists the late Professor Krapp's *English Language in America,* but not his more relevant *Pronunciation of Standard English in America. Graded Objectives* ignores Krapp entirely, and both books ignore Kenyon's *American Pronunciation.* Yet these are the standard works on contemporary American speech.

It seems a pity that, with the resources, energy, ingenuity, and talent at its disposal, the New York City Board of Education could not have adopted a less restricted program of speech improvement. It could have contributed more than the great deal it has already done to good American speech. It could have received more wholehearted co-operation from the rank and file of its teachers, many of whom are silent heretics. And it could have been of greater usefulness to its students by concentrating on something more important than the "broad a."

C. K. THOMAS, *Cornell University.*

The Nature and Treatment of Stammering. By E. J. BOONE AND M. A. RICHARDSON. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1932.

This very interesting book by two officials of the London County Council's Remedial Courses For Stammering Children expresses at some length the British method of meeting the age old problems of (1) how we are to consider the dysfunction that we call stuttering (and that they call stammering) and (2) what to do about it.

Starting with a somewhat general review of the present day theories of the eitology of stammering, they show in what way they disapprove of each. After this, they proceed to delineate the theories by which they work. It is of passing interest to note that first in their list of "causations" they place heredity and mention other possible causes as secondary. In this latter group they place pre- and postnatal influences; tonsils and adenoids; shock; imitation and left-handedness.

A brief mention is made of "raciology" or the tendency for stuttering to appear in families of the northern continental stock rather than in the people from the south of Europe. In a similarly brief discussion the authors quote figures on the "age of onset" of stutter-

ing that closely approximate the figures of the White House Survey made in this country in 1930. A complete chapter concerning the symptoms of stuttering contributes little that had not been said previously by numerous other authors.

The part of the book that is of primary interest, however, is the three-chapter discussion on "treatment." After a short diatribe against the "quack" schools and their methods, including the "trick" variety, such as tapping with the foot, waving the hand, etc., voice training, breathing exercises, speech training and hypnosis, the authors very carefully detail the methods used by the Council's own clinicians. Their method begins with an exhaustive case history that includes a thorough physical examination in addition to interviews with the stutterer's family, school teachers, and physicians. Next, the patient is given a "word association test" which, the authors say, enables the clinician to secure definite and practical information on the possible emotional causes behind the particular case of stuttering being studied. Considerable work is then done in interpreting the dreams of the stutterer. This they feel "to be helpful as a mental indicator." They advise that an inquiry into the dream content should be made in every case. Next is emphasized the great value of "suggestion" in the therapy of stuttering. Lastly, they stress, as the basis for all therapy, exercises in relaxation.

One complete chapter in the book is made up of "the stutterer's view-point" toward his own difficulty. The book is concluded with a short chapter on suggestions as to home, school, and general treatment of stuttering and of the stutterer.

Although we may not agree in entirety with the methodology suggested nor with the reasoning that prompted these men to condemn the methods and the theories that they did, yet the successes they have achieved, according to their own report, makes what they have to say bear considerable weight. The book is concisely and pleasantly written, and is profusely illustrated with case histories that emphasize every point the authors endeavor to make. The book should be of interest to every one in the work of speech correction.

ROBERT WEST *and*
JOSEPH WEPMAN, *University of Wisconsin.*

St. Ignatius and the Ratio Studiorum. Edited by EDWARD A. FITZPATRICK. Translations, "The Constitutions," Part IV, by MARY HELEN MAYER, "The Ratio Studiorum," by A. R. HALL. New York and London: McGraw-Hill, 1933; pp. xi, 275.

[Editor's Note: A review of a Latin edition of the *Ratio Studiorum* appeared under "Old Books" in the June issue of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL. It is of interest to find that this handbook of a long-practised method is now available in English.]

Mr. Fitzpatrick notes that "St. Ignatius of Loyola is even today one of the significant influences in American higher education, and in Catholic higher education the Society of Jesus has the widest influence in the field of professional education as well as in liberal education." In view of this fact it is of particular interest to note provision for speech in the fundamental Jesuit system, as drawn up in the sixteenth century.

The following quotations from "The Constitutions" indicate provision for the speech arts in the system.

Scholastics are to devote themselves to the study of humane letters. Under humane letters rhetoric in addition to grammar is to be learned. . . . Practice in disputation is very useful. . . . A time should be designated each day, at which in the colleges a disputation should be held with some one presiding. . . . Let them exercise themselves in giving sermons and sacred lectures in a way suited to edify the people (which is different from the academic manner), and to do this work let them undertake to learn well the vernacular of the people. It is necessary to have seen and to have on hand other matters that will be useful to this ministry, and finally, in order that they may undertake this task better and with greater profit for souls, they should use all the means that can help them conveniently. . . . These means are to have read the precepts on the manner of preaching which those who have been successful in this work have handed down; and to hear good preachers, and to exercise themselves in preaching in the houses and monasteries, to have a good Corrector, who will admonish them of their error, not only in what they say but also in their voice, tone, gestures, and movements. And let him (the Corrector) call attention to those things which the preacher has said so that he may be better helped on all sides. . . .

Let students cultivate their pronunciation by carefully reading aloud their compositions; and for these, and more especially for the students of the higher faculties, they shall assign frequent disputations. For these disputations certain days and hours shall be appointed, when they shall dispute not only with fellow classmen, but lower classmen with little more advanced classmen in those subjects which they understand; and vice versa the upper classmen with lower classmen by descending to those subjects which the lower classmen are at the time studying; and some teachers will give demonstrations with other teachers always observing that modesty which is fitting, and always with some one presiding who will check contentions, and determine what doctrinal conclusion ought to be drawn from the disputation. . . . As was said in regard to the

college there will be held every week a declamation by one of the scholastics on a subject which will be edifying to the hearers and invite them to strive after an increase in all purity and virtue, so that not only will style be practiced but moral made better. All who know Latin, should be present at the declamations of this kind.

A subdivision of the "Ratio Studiorum" is devoted to "Rules for the Professor of Rhetoric." Quintilian, Cicero, and particularly Aristotle are to supply the precepts, Cicero the model. Orations are to be translated. On the last class hour of each Saturday one of the students should give a declamation or prelection, or the class should conduct a concertation or attend a lecture. Passages should be memorized and portions of the best authors should be recited from the platform "in order to exercise the memory and connect gestures with words." Students are to be taught invention of thought by the use of the *loci communes*. Each month the student is to write a complete oration which is to be criticized as such in its various parts by the teacher. Greek oratory is dealt with in much the same fashion.

Every month in the chapel there is to be given "a rather serious oration, a poem, or both, now in Latin, now in the vernacular; or a debate with arguments on both sides and a decision. Occasionally the master is allowed to propose to the scholars some short action as of an eclogue, drama, or dialogue, so that those which have been written the best of all may be presented with the class, parts being assigned to the student, but without any elaborate staging."

The volume contains an analytical outline of the "Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius." The methodology of these exercises should prove very inteersting to specialists in speech. The translations in the volume offer readable English. An index is supplied.

WILLIAM M. LAMERS, *Marquette University*.

The Art of Conference. By FRANK WALSER. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1933; pp. 305, $3.

The author of this book is not a teacher of speech—a fact that might be depressing to those who regret the failure of the professors to produce such studies—nor a text-writer. As a systematic theorist he might be found fault with. But he writes from the experience of a variety of conferences probably far exceeding the acquaintance of any teacher of speech; and that experience has been wisely assimilated and applied with discrimination to the problems, both broad and detailed, of the conference method of discussion. His consistent emphasis upon the social and philosophic implications of the subject

gives the treatise a unity of point of view more valuable, perhaps, than the best text-book scheme.

There are just six chapters: I. "The New Importance of Conference," II. "Silence in Conference," III. "Planning for the Conference," IV. "Conducting the Conference," V. "Personal Integration in Conference," and VI. "Social Change and Conference." These are followed by ten appendices which summarize actual conferences, sometimes too briefly to be intelligible but well enough on the whole to show the multiple occasions to which the preceding chapters apply. There is a short but surprisingly eclectic bibliography; and occasional cross-references in the text are useful auxiliaries to the index.

The most novel of the chapters, though probably not most original, since the author acknowledges the influence of Quaker tradition, is that on "Silence in Conference." When conflict threatens the co-operative process of group discussion, and self-defense distracts attention from thought that may lead to new beliefs, pause is recommended. "When Socrates waited for the promptings of the 'demon' within, he was not nursing a superstition but a method in thinking reasonably." Mr. Walzer realizes, probably from much painful observation, that "in some conferees a silent pause, even though it renews the personality, may increase that insistence of firm believers which so resists co-operation." There is no solution for that difficulty except "the chairman's resources for dealing with fixed ideas;" but possibly it would happen less often if confrerees were not novices in the use of silence. "With some," at least, "the clear contrast of much talking suddenly stilled will drive them to face the honesty of their contributoins. Inconsistencies of attitude with belief, of impulses with reason, may suddenly appear with painful but sobering contrast."

Will some chairman of an intercollegiate debate presently announce before the rebuttal speeches begin, "There will now be a ten-minute pause for the debaters to face the honesty of their contributions?"

The chapter on "Planning the Conference" supplies excellent advice which unfortunately can rarely be followed in any but the simplest conference groups, for it depends primarily on the first topic treated, the selection of members. Since appointments of delegates to industrial and political conferences, and even to many supposedly disinterested groups, are essentially political, those who would like to make such conferences successful by proper selection

of the members might as well solve all the problems of human beings at once by selecting their ancestors. "Wherever a member has his own intention to shine, to propagate his own ideas, or to get some private advantage, rather than to co-operate toward a discovery which will be helpful to all, he will hinder the conference. For such an intention excludes common action and will conflict with the group's purpose. It may even destroy the group." These words describe not only a general truth but the history of a multitude of conferences. Mr. Walzer recognizes this fact, though his only prescription for the fatal malady is to avoid it. Perhaps if the public generally just recognized the fact as he does, the malady might be avoided—if it were made politically expedient to choose conferees who would contribute to the conference instead of being, in the author's words, "obsessed by the fear of displeasing the localities or parties they represent" and "satisfied with a show of insistence and speech-making."

Mr. Walzer is more optimistic of the potential effects of conference discussion than of the proximity of its general adoption, though he describes with perhaps exaggerated enthusiasm the progress that has been made. "The transference of more initiative from the few commercially minded lords of our ideals, purchases, and ways of fashioning our lives, to the group-integrated many, exploring and seeeking together with open minds, will be the long struggle of the next two centuries." This is his prophecy. Since the fundamental attitudes, as well as the technique, of the art of conference depend upon reforming the habits of individuals, the allotment of two centuries is probably hopeful. But he might have made it less if it were not for his conviction, right or wrong, that where such habits are most vitally influenced, in the schools and colleges, "the destructive spirit of debate . . . which whips up intellectual activity and fine logic, not for creating together, but for aggressive rivalry and conquest" is being "so harmfully cultivated."

V. E. SIMRELL, *Dartmouth College.*

Henry Ward Beecher's Art of Preaching. By LIONEL F. CROCKER. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1934; pp. 145.

This book is an attempt to state the rhetorical theory of Henry Ward Beecher, using as sources Beecher's Yale *Lectures on Preaching,* his *Successful Preaching, Lecture on Oratory, Address to Students* and *True Preaching,* supplemented by sermons and sermon outlines to which Professor Crocker has access.

The book is divided according to traditional divisions of rhetoric into three parts: invention, arrangement, and style. To these three the author has added a conclusion and five short appendices. In each of the three major divisions constant reference is made to the classical and modern rhetoricians and Beecher's theory is evaluated in the light of these authorities. Although the study is scholarly and the attitude scientific, Beecher is treated in a thoroughly sympathetic manner throughout.

Perhaps Beecher, after all, had no systematic theory of rhetoric. In fact, as Dr. Crocker points out in his Conclusion, "he explicitly denied any intention of elaborating a rhetorical theory." And perhaps here is just where this book proves most valuable. It is not, after all, a statement of theory by a rhetorician but rather a statement of just how one very successful speaker went about his preparation and delivery of speeches. We have had a variety of books telling us how speeches ought to be made: here is one that tells us how one speaker actually made his speeches. There must be many a budding orator who will be able to profit by this narrative. Many will not profit greatly, and some will get off to a false start by learning that Beecher always composed his sermons extemporaneously, after much general and some specific preparation. Not all speakers will be able to follow in Beecher's steps. But some will be, and to such a path may be opened for the first time. For it is undoubtedly true that some speakers, like Beecher, will find their greatest, and only adequate, inspiration to composition to be the actual audience. As for the others, if they cannot emulate at least they will be interested to learn "how the other half" speaks.

The parts devoted to preparation and to the use of the illustration are especially valuable and illuminating. Much of this material, at least, will be useful to any student of public speaking. The use of illustration cannot be too often or too enthusiastically commended to those who, like Beecher, aspire to interest the great mass of common people. And if "language gets in your way" you will find some solace in the fact that with Beecher "it didn't stand a chance." A certain degree of unconventionality in the use of English is not amiss, with Beecher or with you.

The book should find a large use as collateral in classes where public speaking is being studied and practiced. It is an excellent statement of the methods found effective by one of America's greatest preachers, if not her greatest.

RAY K. IMMEL, *University of Southern California.*

On Reading Shakespeare. By LOGAN PEARSALL SMITH. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1933; pp. 191.

A few years ago I was discussing a course in Shakespearean reading with a professor of English literature. This professor politely told me that he didn't think that a professor of speech had the background to teach such a course. At the time I disagreed with the professor, for I thought that even though a teacher of speech might lack the critical background to interpret some of the abstruse passages of Shakespeare there was enough in Shakespeare that could be used for oral interpretation by the teacher of speech. Of course I believe that the teacher of speech should be well grounded in critical scholarship, but it is not necessary that he be a scholar in Shakespearean criticism. I believe, too, that he ought to read widely in Shakespearean literature.

One new book that will greatly aid the teacher of Shakespearean Reading is this book by Logan Pearsall Smith. In a very short time Mr. Smith puts the reader in touch with much of the thought of recent years about Shakespeare. Indeed, the book might very well become a handbook for such a course. Surely for a student of speech the following is a useful observation: "This method which Shakespeare invented — of making his people talk themselves alive — is surely the most marvellous of all his marvellous inventions."

There are scores of such helpful observations. If the author had had teachers of literary interpretation and analysis in mind when he wrote this book he could not have written a book that would have been more welcome. Interested as we are in speech that is vibrant with life, such a paragraph as the following makes us rejoice that the thing we seek to do is so important:

> If, therefore, I were advising any youth of high aims, who might entertain the ambition of reviving the dead art of the English drama, or the dying art of the English novel, I should suggest to him (although he would certainly not listen) that he should study above all the speech-rhythms, the syntax, the hesitations, the tricks of phrase and verbal sing-song of the people with whom he talks; for this shimmering texture of human speech, significant as it is both with the states of soul and with the meanings and tensions and clashes of human beings in their relations with each other, is, for the writers of drama or fiction, the very stuff of life, the stuff out of which are woven plays like those of Shakespeare, novels like those of Jane Austen, Scott, and Dickens.

LIONEL CROCKER, *Denison University.*

Iowa English Organization Test. By JEAN BRADY JONES AND HARRY A. GREEN. Iowa City: Bureau of Educational Research and Service, Extension Division, State University of Iowa.

The stated purpose of the test is to measure students' ability "to comprehend the meaning of simple sentences, to hold in mind a number of related ideas, to perceive the various relationships existing among all the ideas contained in each group of sentences, and finally to arrange them in a logical sequence" (Examiner's Manual, Sec. 1). The test consists of five groups of sentences, arranged in illogical order. The student is asked to arrange the sentences so that each group constitutes a well-constructed paragraph. "Each exercise is constructed in such a way that there is one and only one arrangement of the sentences which will make clear the meaning of references in one sentence to thoughts contained in other sentences, and which will permit all of the connectives to function clearly and in a logical manner" (Sec. 1). The ability to organize paragraphs, say the authors, is recognized by teachers of oral and written English as one of "the basic language skills."

The test has been given to about 1700 high school and college students and shows a high reliability (Secs. 3 and 6).

The novel and valuable feature of the scoring method used is described by the authors (Sec. 2):

> The student is graded, not directly on his work on the arrangement of the sentences in what he considers their proper sequence, but on a series of questions concerning the arrangement [*i.e.* Which sentence did you put after A?] If the student were scored on his listing of the sentences in their numerical positions . . . of the exercise, the misplacing of one sentence might throw each preceding or each succeeding sentence out of its proper place in the arranged sequence, thus making one mistaken relationship count as several errors in the scoring of the exercise.

Two forms, of approximately equal difficulty, contsitute the complete series. The first form is to be given at the beginning of a term or semester, and the second form is to be given at the end of the period. In this way, not only is the paragraphing ability at a given time measured, but the improvement over a length of time can be gauged.

SHERMAN P. LAWTON, *University of Wisconsin.*

The Wholesome Personality. By WILLIAM H. BURNHAM. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1932; pp. 713.

In *The Wholesome Personality,* as in his former contribution to mental hygiene, *The Normal Mind,* Dr. Burnham has made available to teachers and to students of human behavior facts and judgments of unusual value. "The studies of the last seven years," the author says, "have made possible an extended addition to the former work with a broader conception and a wider application" of the principles which relate to "the preservation and development of an integrated personality."

The wholesome perosnality is the integrated one. Integration is not a passive state of equilibrium but an active, dynamic condition, the essential characteristic of which is "the power of adaptation or co-ordinated activity in relation to any situation." As stated in the preface, "The book is an attempt to present the scientific conception of the normal integrated personality, the conditions that seem favorable to its wholesome development, and also some of the conditions likely to produce personality disorders. It is positive, dynamic, constructive. It emphasizes the normal rather than the pathological, the prevention rather than the cure of mental disorder."

Here, as in his other writings, Dr. Burnham gives the reader the full benefit of years of personal investigation of his subject, extensive reading and personal contact with other investigators, all of which have been analyzed, weighed, and balanced in a manner which leaves one with the conviction that here is authoritative opinion maturely formulated and expressed with care.

Although more than seven hundred pages in length, the book is exceedingly readable. The presentation is clear and the author's pleasing literary style is enhanced by many pertinent illustrations. The book is well indexed and the table of contents provides a helpful outline of each of the eighteen chapters for those who may wish to use it as a textbook. Of further value in this respect are the carefully selected and extensive bibliographies at the ends of the chapters.

The Wholesome Personality is a book which every teacher of speech will find interesting, helpful in a practical way and suggestive of methods and materials which may be used in the classroom and in the personal interview. It is, itself, an integration along broad genetic lines, of the best that has been done and said with respect to personality, its make-up and its receptive and expressive dynamisms.

FREDERICK W. BROWN, *Garden City, New York.*

Comparative Psychology. Edited by F. A. Moss. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1934; pp. 529.

This volume contains fifteen chapters by twelve authors: namely, Thorndyke, Waters, Stone, Moss, Purdy, Fields, Franz, Liddell, Heron, Tolman, and Tinklepaugh. Of particular interest are the chapters on "The Neurology of Learning" by Franz, "The Conditioned Reflex" by Liddell, and "Social Psychology of Animals" by Tinklepaugh. The discussions on aphasia, cerebral dominance, handedness, and language in sub-human species are new and stimulating.

L. S. JUDSON, *University of Illinois.*

Federal Aid for Education, Vol. I, Debater's Help Book. Compiled and edited by E. C. BUEHLER. New York: Noble & Noble, 1934; pp. vi, 276; 85 cents.

This handbook, dealing with the question selected for debate in high schools this year by the National University Extension Association, is a model that should be followed by the multitudinous so-called debate information services. Professor Buehler's briefs are so complete that no team will attempt to use them in place of original analyses; his answers to questions that may arise in the interpretation of the proposition invariably lead the debater back from attractive bypaths to the main highway of sensible and fair discussion; the bibliography is carefully prepared; and the articles selected for reprinting are varied and solid enough to offer a satisfactory introduction to the subject. This well-bound volume is certainly a bargain at the price.

R. F. H.

REAVIS, WILLIAM C., *Interscholastic Non-Athletic Activities in Selected Secondary Schools.* School Review, XLI, June 1933, 417-428.

Information was secured from 224 high schools of all sizes and types, and from all parts of the country. It was indicated that a high percentage of all such schools (70.5%) participated in non-athletic contests. The lowest percentage is among junior high schools (40%), and the highest among senior high schools (100%). Again, the highest percent is among schools of 100 enrollment, or fewer (85.2%), the next highest being among schools of more than 2,000 enrollment.

Thirty-two types of contest (non-tournament) were ranked according to the number of students participating. Debating and

oratory ranked high (sixth and eighth respectively), Declamatory and Dramatic Reading eleventh and twelfth, Extempore Speaking nineteenth and Dramatics twenty-ninth. Of the twenty-eight tournament types of contest, Debate ranks seventh in number participating, Oratory ninth, Declamatory twelfth, Dramatic Reading fifteenth, Extempore Speaking eighteenth, and Dramatics twenty-fifth.

The article further discusses interscholastic associations, scholarship standards, coaching, and financial support. The author recognizes the opportunities, suggesting that these various types of contest may have a value approximately proportionate to the number of students participating, and pointing out that the great task of administrators is to arouse public and financial support for these non-athletic contests.

G. W. G.

PARMENTER, C. E., TREVIÑO, S. N. and BEVANS, C. A., *The Influence of a Change in Pitch on the Articulation of a Vowel.* Language, IX, No. 1, March 1933. 72-81.

Three male subjects, one American, one French and one Spanish, were selected, each pronouncing nineteen vowels, which were X-rayed at low and at high pitch, the sounds also being recorded on an aluminum record. Composite tracings were made of the photographs and careful measurements taken. The modifications accompanying a rise in pitch consist of (1) the rise of the larynx, (2) changes in the superglottal cavities due to the rise of the larynx, and (3) changes in these cavities not due to the rise of the larynx. Both physiological and acoustical explanations of these modifications are presented.

G. W. G.

IN THE PERIODICALS

MABIE, E. C., and Others (Editors), *The Archives of Speech*, Vol. I, No. 1, January 1934. Published at the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

It is rare indeed that so significant a publication as the present issue of this new semi-periodical has come into the hands of this reviewer. For many years there has been an increasing need for a journal that would reflect the serious and scholarly research that is now being undertaken in many of our university departments of speech. Most of us have known that such studies were in progress, or had even been completed, but unfortunately, few of us have had the opportunity of profiting by the reports of these investigations. Significant theses as well as independent studies, representing months if not years of intensive experimentation and profound analysis, and presenting data and conclusions that would if published materially affect our understanding and our theories of the function of speech, have been completely buried in libraries, or occasionally published in periodicals outside our own field, journals with which comparatively few teachers of speech have more than a passing acquaintance.

This first issue of *The Archives of Speech*, under the editorship of Dr. Joseph Tiffin, and entitled "Studies in Experimental Phonetics," presents reports on five highly important experimental investigations, two of which are abridged from doctoral theses. All the papers were written in the Department of Speech at the State University of Iowa. The articles with their respective authors are:

Lynch, Gladys E.: A Phonophotographic Study of Trained and Untrained Voices Reading Factual and Dramatic Material, pp. 9–25.

Kelly, Joseph P.: Studies in Nasality, pp. 26–42.

Lewis, Don and Tiffin, Joseph: A Psychological Study of Individual Differences in Speaking Ability, pp. 43–60.

Murray, Elwood and Tiffin, Joseph: An Analysis of Some Basic Aspects of Effective Speech, pp. 61–83.

Kelly, Joseph P. and Higley, L. B.: A Contribution to the X-Ray Study of Tongue Position in Certain Vowels, pp. 84–95.

According to announcements accompanying the present issue of *The Archives*, we are promised within the year a volume of approx-

imately five hundred pages. Forthcoming numbers will be devoted to other aspects of the general field of speech, including Speech Pedagogy, Speech Pathology, and Public Speaking. Future numbers are "open for the inclusion of additional reports of research."

With the first number of this journal as a criterion, it is entirely reasonable to urge that every serious teacher of speech should have immediately available the entire volume. G. W. G.

HINCKS, HARVEY SCOTT, *The Place of Dramatics in a Teacher's College.* English Journal (College Edition), XXII, April 1933, 302–310.

The author objects to the use of the term "amateur" as referring to "lack of finesse, lack of poise, a picture of awkward, gawky boys and girls besmeared with grease paint, rouge, and lipstick, of garish, overly-furnished stage-sets under a glare of brilliant lighting," and presents "amateur" as meaning "service and interest without pecuniary reward." On such a basis, amateur dramatics can be raised to a high level of performance.

The professionally trained director is rarely successful in educational dramatics. "He apes the mannerisms and the mode of thinking of the professional theatre director. He is unaware of the aims and objectives of the academic world. The school director of dramatics must be trained by the college. Much directing is perforce done by teachers of English. So widespread is this practise that "a course in dramatics in this age of progressive education is almost a neecessity for every teacher of English."

It is not the lack of funds, but a misunderstanding of the artistic and cultural worth of drama, which constitutes the greatest obstacle to successful production. Such misunderstanding arises largely from the directors and teachers of dramatic production themselves, because of wrong emphasis. The educator is coming to realize that "in this new approach to learning he has found a vehicle or tool by which he can entice the varying interests of a group of differing minds."

G.W.G.

HOCH, IRENE CHILDREY, *Aims of Junior College Speech Training.* The Junior College Journal, IV, No. 2, November 1933, 78-81.

POOLE, IRENE, *Aims for Speech or Oral English Programs.* Education, LIV, No. 5, January 1934, 280-282.

STENIUS, ARTHUR, Double-Action Speech Work. The English Journal, XXIII, No. 2, February 1934, 127-129.

The first writer refers to the need for adapting speech courses to the three groups of students in the junior colleges. Basic courses in public speaking, interpretation, and dramatics should be given to those students who are preparing for the university; semi-professional courses might be offered to those students who propose to enter professional schools. To meet the needs of the "terminal group" is the most difficult problem. Here the instruction, adapted to individual needs, should be intended primarily for the development of habits of effective thinking and cultivation of an approved technique in delivery.

Among the aims which Mrs. Poole lists for a program in Speech or Oral English are: "Adequate functioning of the physical structures that produce speech"; "Acquisition of good diction and accepted pronunciation"; "Efficiency in vocal and articulatory expression"; "Acquirement of techniques necessary to influence the behavior of others"; "Development of individual personality"; "Appreciation of literature through the oral interpretation of written English"; and "Training in leadership through participation in preparation and execution of group activities."

Mr. Stenius suggests a program for stimulating interest in speech assignments and for "vivifying the teaching in other courses that are in no way connected with public speaking." Through departmental co-operation students may prepare and deliver before the history classes, for example, those orations which fit into the pattern of study outlined for the history groups. The same might be worked out for courses in economics and literature.

LESTER THONSSEN, *College of the City of New York*

MONTAGUE, C. E., *Three Ways of Saying Things.* Scholastic, 24, No. 14, May 12, 1934, 7-8.

A Panel Discussion of "To What Extent Does Radio Broadcasting in the United States Need Public Regulation?" Journal of Adult Education, VI, No. 3, June 1934, 278-285.

MON-LING, CHANG, *Basic English.* Educational Review (Chinese), XXV, No. 4, October 1933, 293-303.

SHERETZ, D. L., *Is Basic English Basic?* Educational Review (Chinese), XXV, No. 4, October 1933, 304-316.

———, *Can Basic English Help Me and My Chinese Students?* Educational Review (Chinese), XXVI, No. 1, January 1934, 100-105.

The first is a reprint in abridged form of the article by Mr. Mon-

tague which appeared in the *Century Magazine* in April, 1929. It is a discussion of three means of persuasion: Statement, Overstatement, and Understatement; and, in Mr. Montague's words, "Given a congenial context, every one of them is right."

As a method of settling problems the Panel, or any allied type of discussion, receives its full share of consideration each time the debate coaches engage in their frequent attempts to determine whether debates of the traditional sort should be continued. Directors of debate will, nevertheless, be interested in examining this panel discussion of which Professor Overstreet was chairman. The question was introduced by the chairman who then permitted a panel of distinguished individuals to express views—but not to deliver speeches—bearing upon the topic. The audience also had an opportunity to enter into the discussion near the close of the meeting.

Whereas Mr. Mon-Ling explains briefly the general features of the now well-known Basic English scheme, Mr. Sheretz, in his first article, concludes that the English is basic by citing that 64% of the words in the scheme can be found in either one or the other, or both, of Ayres' 1000 commonest words in English writing and Thorndike's 1000 commonest words in English reading. In his second article Mr. Sheretz cites personal experiences to suggest that Professor Ogden's language plan is practicable.

L.T.

SCHONELL, FRED J., *The Relation between Defective Speech and Disability in Spelling.* The British Journal of Educational Psychology, IV, Part II, June 1934, 123-139.

CLARKE, ROGER T., *The Drum Language of the Tumba People.* The American Journal of Sociology, XL, No. 1, July 1934, 34-48.

SELLING, LOWELL S., and STEIN, SEYMOUR P., *Vocabulary and Argot of Delinquent Boys.* The American Journal of Sociology, XXXIX, No. 5, March 1934, 674-677.

The first is a study of 105 cases of specific disability in spelling. Most important of the conclusions are:

> (1) Speech defects are a cause of backwardness in spelling and reading on account of the handicap they occasion in setting up a foundation of accurate articulatory-auditory units. . . .
>
> (2) Intense functional paraphemia was the speech defect which was the most potent cause of disability in spelling. . . .
>
> (3) Stammering appears to hinder normal achievement in spelling only in children where the extent and severity of their nervous instability are serious.
>
> (4) Faulty pronunciation is a minor contributory force in the spelling backwardness of some children.

Mr. Clark presents an interesting account, with transcriptions, of the drum language of the Bantu tribes. This is a system of signals, devised to serve the needs of people living in densely-forested regions, "beaten with two sticks on a hollowed wooden drum which gives out two notes corresponding to the two tones of the vowels of the language." These signals "represent the tones of the syllables of conventional phrases. . . . The phrases are sufficient in number that the code can be used for a large variety of messages. . . . "

Messrs. Selling and Stein present a vocabulary study of one hundred boys in a corrective school and comparison with a group of high school boys "from an area of low delinquency." The study reveals that "the argot of the delinquent boy is somewhat characteristic of his group, and serves to differentiate it from the general population." Furthermore, the study tends "to show that the delinquent boy is handicapped when tested by a scale requiring verbal responses. . . . "

L.T.

RAHSKOPF, HORACE G., *Society, Speech and the Schools.* Washington Educational Journal, XIII, Nos. 5 and 6, February and March 1934, 105-106; 126-127.

Despite the importance which psychologists, sociologists and anthropologists attach to speech in its relation to intelligence, social organization and civilization itself, few schools have a systematic program of speech training, largely because educators in general are not yet fully aware of the fundamental nature of speech training. A true program of speech training involves a process of "mastering a necessary equipment for life in a complex civilization." A systematic program is one that includes analysis of pupil needs, with remedial work and ample opportunity for actual performance in speaking. All this necessitates a trained teaching staff, having a background of thorough scholarship. Speech is not to be considered "incidental" to the regular school program, but basic to it.

G.W.G.

TYLER, TRACY F. (Editor), *Radio as a Cultural Agency.* Washington, D.C., Published by The National Committee on Education by Radio, 1934.

On May 7 and 8, 1934, a two-day conference was held, sponsored by the National Committee on Education by Radio. Some hundred representatives of varied interests in American life met to consider

some of the basic problems of radio as a cultural agency in American institutions. The present booklet comprises the "Proceedings" of that conference. Approximately twenty-five papers, addresses and discussions are reported, covering a considerable number of those fundamental problems. G.W.G.

STEPHENS, S. S., *The Volume and Intensity of Tones.* American Journal of Psychology, XLVI, No. 3. July 1934, 397-408.

There seems to be experimental evidence of a characteristic of pure tones which may be called "largeness," "massiveness," or "impressiveness," but quantitative results have not been consistent. The magnitudes of the volumic limens have varied considerably. It has been suggested, even, that volume consists merely in the failure to localize the source.

The method of average error, allowing the observers to manipulate the tones, is suitable to the study of volume, which is found to be a "complex function of both the frequency and the amplitude of the stimulus." G.W.G.

UTTERBACK, WILLIAM E., *"Opining."* American Journal of Psychology, XLVI, No. 3, July 1934, 503-506.

Psychologists have done comparatively little active descriptive work upon the group of operations known as supposition, doubt, query, conviction and opinion. With regard to the last named, together with its active form, "opining," there is no clear and standard definition. The author presents a number of hypothetical cases involving the formulation of opinion, and suggests that a "satisfactory analytical description of the active opining might be secured by report under experimental conditions." G.W.G.

SWADESH, MORRIS, *The Phonemic Principle.* Language, X, June 1934, 117-129.

"The phonemic principle when properly understood provides the only completely consistent and adequate method of understanding the nature of the phonetics of a given language. Phonetics provides the technique of discovering and defining the phonemes. Morphology includes a study of the phonemic structure of morphemes and of morphological interrelations among phonemes as components of morphemes. Historical phonology studies the evolution of phonemes. In these ways phonemics interrelates with other phases of linguistic science, but it does not compete with these other phases. In develop-

ing the phonemic principle, its proponents are only bringing into plain view a hitherto imperfectly lighted area in which there has always been a certain amount of stumbling." (Author's own summary.) G.W.G.

VOELKER, CHARLES H.; *The Occurrence of Homophenous Articulation in American Usage.* The American Annals of the Deaf, May, 1934.

"Speech sounds that have the same or very similar visual identity are termed homophenous articulations." The closure of the lips on *p, b* and *m* give them a visual identity that sometimes makes it difficult for a lip reader to distinguish among them. Similarly, *t, d* and *n* have homogenous positions.

The *n-t-d* position occurs most frequently in American usage, almost three times as often as any other articulation. The *t-d* movement, with *s-z, n* and *r,* make up more than half the sounds. The [j] and the [ŋ] have the least frequency.

In the *th* position, the sound will be voiced five times out of six. In the *s-z* position, it will be unvoiced two thirds of the time. In the *w-wh* position, the sound is five times as likely to be a [w].

Two tables are given, showing in tabular form the relative frequencies of these articulatory positions. G.W.G.

VOELKER, CHARLES H. *Phonetic Distribution in Formal American Pronunciation.* Journal of the Acoustical Society of America. V, April 1934, 242-246.

The objective in this study was to determine the relative frequency of the different speech sounds in what might be called "formal" American pronunciation. More than six hundred sixty thousand speech sounds were examined, as they occurred in almost six thousand radio announcements. Records included announcements of advertising and entertainment, as well as the reading of prose and poetry. These announcements were recorded phonographically, and then transcribed phonetically, the I.P.A. symbols being used. Some difficulty was encountered in distinguishing between [ɪ] and [ə], [ʌ] and [ə], and among [ʌ], [ə], and [ʊ]. The first two of these occur a total of 14.68%, the second two 8.22%, and the third group of three, 9.98%. Standing alone, [ɪ] occurs 7.88%, [ə] 6.80%, while [ʍ], (as in *whip*), occurs 0.37%. Relatively 61.8% of all sounds spoken are consonants, six of these sounds making up more than 50% of all consonants. There are only 4% more voiced

than voiceless sounds used, after allowing for the fact that there are fewer voiceless sounds in the English language. G.W.G.

ADDITIONAL ARTICLES OF INTEREST

BLAKE, W. H., *A Preliminary Study of the Interpretation of Bodily Expression.* Teachers College Contributions to Education, 1933, No. 574.

LEWIS, DON. *A Tone Integrator: Apparatus for the Study of Timbre.* Psychological Bulletin, XXX, 1933, 584.

WEVER, E. G., *The Physiology of Hearing: The Nature of Response in the Cochlea.* Physiological Review, 1933; No. 3, 400–426.

KREEZER, G., The *Significance of the Auditory Electrical Effects for Auditory Theory.* American Journal of Psychology, XLVI, 1934, 1–18.

HERZOG, H. *Stimme und Persönlichkeit.* Zeitschrift für Psychologie, CXXX, 1933, 300–369.

LATIF, I., *The Physiological Basis of Linguistic Development and of the Ontogeny of Meaning.* Psychological Review, XLI, 1934, Pts. i, ii, iii.

CONTEMPORARY SPEECHES

[Speeches reviewed are available in full text either in special sources as noted or in the newspapers.]

DEBATES IN THE SECOND SESSION OF THE SEVENTY-THIRD CONGRESS.

The Congress which adjourned in June passed a most imposing list of bills; few Congresses have done so much, good or bad, depending upon one's point of view. Friday, June 15, Representative Joseph W. Byrnes of Tennessee made a good speech in the House of Representatives discussing from the majority side the accomplishments of the session. In its issue of June 23 the magazine *Today* has a list of thirty-four important bills passed. Among them may be mentioned the Securities Act, the Federal Credit Union Act, the Bankhead Cotton Control Act, the Jones-Costigan Sugar Control Act, the reciprocal treaties act, the Johnson Act on foreign loans, the Vinson Act, the Philippine Independence Act, and a new treaty with Cuba abrogating the Platt Amendment. More talk was expended upon the St. Lawrence Treaty, which was not ratified, than on any one of these bills.

At this writing, three of the bound volumes of the *Congressional Record* for this session have appeared, 3438 pages.[1] The whole record of the session will cover 13,110 pages. On these thirteen thousand pages the teacher of speech can find thousands of examples of all kinds of speeches and debates.

Few speeches not inserted under leave to print are free from interruptions. A good example of a speaker's being able to stop time and again to answer objections and yet to resume smoothly the burden of his speech was Senator Costigan's defense of his sugar bill.[2] A number of good speeches on the new income tax bill, also punctuated with interruptions, were made in the House. Mr. Doughton of North Carolina, who had charge of the debate upon it, spoke very ably.[3] Senator Wagner, who knows unemployment problems

[1] Volume 78 refers to all the *Record* of the second session of the 73rd Congress. It is issued in parts of about 1,100 pages each, paged continuously.

[2] *Record*, 2869 ff.

[3] *Ibid.*, 2511 ff.

thoroughly, made a lucid and convincing speech on the CWA, answering questions and erbutting arguments as he went along.[4]

Two speeches upon the plight of the veteran may be mentioned, Senator Hatfield's, demanding repeal of the Economy Act[5] and Senator Schall's, also sympathizing with the mistreated veteran.[6] This sad situation of the veteran received frequent reference in the pages of the *Record*. The introduction of Senator Schall's speech may give the real reason:

> Mr. President, I ask leave to insert in the *Record* a letter I have just received from the Minneapolis Chapter No. 1, of the Disabled Veterans of the World War.
>
> This letter sets out, with facts and figures, the concrete results of the dictatorship this Congress has created for the veterans; and they sound ominous for any one who chances to come up for election.

Another introduction, which will show what a Congressman can do with the language when he tries, I take from a speech upon federal prisons made in the House by Mr. Shoemaker of Minnesota:

> Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, were I in possession of the wisdom of Solomon, the eloquence of William Jennings Bryan, the sincerity of Saint Francis, the patience of Job, the physique of Horatius, combined with the touch of King Midas, the organization ability of Lenin, the rabble-rousing proficiency of a Hitler, my combined accomplishments would not do justice to the subject which I wish to discuss here today. Noah Webster, hitting on high, would lack the vocabulary necessary to describe the corruption, crime, and degeneracy that now exists in our so-called "prison system" of the United States of America.[7]

If one may judge from the speeches, most of the Senators and Congressmen find themselves in deep water upon economic questions such as those which have confronted the country in the last three years. When, therefore, an opportunity for a good partisan fight comes along, they throw themselves into it with all the zest that comes form long silence. Such a fight was made over the cancellation of the air-mail contracts. Senator Fess, an ex-college professor, enjoyed it as much as the rest.[8]

There are any number of speeches of anniversary in the *Record* for this session. There was a deluge of them—given and not given—on Lincoln's birthday. Washington, apparently, did not get his share.

[4] *Ibid.*, 2179–2182.
[5] *Ibid.*, 2730–2744.
[6] *Ibid.*, 2744–2745.
[7] *Ibid.*, 2637.
[8] *Ibid.*, 2342 ff.

A glance through the index will produce, for any one who is interested, speeches upon every anniversary from the birth of Susan B. Anthony to the sinking of the "Maine."

The highwater mark, in my opinion, of good argument was reached in May and June in the debates upon the reciprocal tariff treaties bill. Excellent speeches were made by Senators Borah, Costigan, George, and Robinson of Arkansas. The constitutional arguments were, perhaps, as good as the Senate has heard.

Mr. Thomas L. Blanton of Texas is still the man in Congress who talks most. He made "remarks" of sufficient length to be cited in the index upon more than a hundred subjects, from Alcoholic Beverages in the Canal Zone to the United States Botanical Garden. A glance through the *Record* will show that in addition to these speeches he made countless interjections. Senator Huey Long is Blanton's equal; his pet hate this session was the St. Lawrence Treaty. I have made no attempt to count the times he spoke upon it, but I venture the guess that he said something about the treaty on two or three hundred occasions. For inane comments and speeches Long and Robinson of Indiana in the Senate, and McFadden and Blanton in the House, are clearly the leaders. Hamilton Fish is close, however, to Blanton and McFadden.

The House this session made what seems to me a good rule upon the evil of leave to print. It restricted members to printing their own speeches and forbade the printing of other material. Members were, however, allowed as usual to insert speeches they did not make. The Senate was not thus to be limited: Senators printed in the *Record* editorials, telegrams, petitions, letters from constituents, and so forth—at a cost to the taxpayer of forty dollars a page. Senator Fess obtained immortality for an article from the *Saturday Evening Post,* which he had printed in full.[9]

The general persuasive value that the members of Congress put upon their speeches may, perhaps, be summed up in a remark made by Hamilton Fish of New York: "It is not necessary for the Members to stay, but there is no reason why I should not be allowed to talk."[10]

DAYTON D. MCKEAN, *Princeton University.*

[9] *Ibid.,* 3381–3385.
[10] *Ibid.,* 2436.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT: MESSAGE TO CONGRESS, JUNE 8; RADIO SPEECH, JUNE 28; SPEECH AT GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN, AUGUST 9.

The rhetorical campaign of the National Administration during most of 1933 was concentrated against Fear. The Inaugural Address nearly won the objective in the beginning and the success of the President's later speeches was great enough to make it something of a problem not to over-reach the goal with a trouble-making psychological boom.

So far during 1934, the campaign has been directed chiefly against Confusion. The complixity of the economic problems undertaken and the inevitable antagonisms of interests and doctrines involved in their solution have of course confused many who ardently support the President, much more those whose support is fickle and understanding perhaps none too acute. The various alphabetical administrations, the committees set up to correlate the agencies of the New Deal, and the committees set up to correlate the correlating committees have made it easy for opponents to dramatize the apparent divisions and cross-purposes within the Administration. Judged by the efforts both to refute the criticism and to remove its justification, the Administration has been more sensitive to this than to any other attack. And it seems highly probable that the support of the public might be vitally influenced by this test. A strongly centralized executive government divided in its purposes would have the faults of concentrated power without the excuses and compensations of a divided legislature. It has been all-important, therefore to save the popularity of the New Deal from being poisoned by the suggestions of such deadly caricatures as Mr. Hoover's "the new shuffle" and Al Smith's "alphabet soup."

Mr. Roosevelt's major efforts of this campaign have been based on a consistent strategy combining (1) a simple key to the manifold plans and activities of the Administration, (2) the unifying point of view of the individual man and woman, and (3) a careful—but casual, to make the care not too conspicuous—organization of his own speeches to encourage that universal inclination to think the answer right when the solution of the problem comes out even.

The "key" is Relief, Recovery, and Reconstruction, the three Rooseveltian R's, several but inseparable. The alliteration seems predestined, at least after the fact. The co-ordination of the three R's, with special elaboration of the third, furnishes the pattern of both the Message to Congress and the radio address to the people; it is the assumed premise of the Green Bay speech.

But without a human point of view, the three R's would be a mere formula, artificially assembled and too abstract to be persuasive. Reconstruction—source of the greatest difficulties of the campaign—is hence translated into "security for the individual and for the family," which is further translated into terms of "decent homes," the location of homes where it is possible to "engage in productive work," and insurance against the poverty of old age and unemployment. Both the Message and the radio address clearly envision Reconstruction from this point of view and in similar terms. The Green Bay speech gives that point of view the label of "the average man"—three times repeated and hence, perhaps, intended to supplant in popular quotation "the forgotten man." (Perhaps the change represents a movement slightly to the Right, the "forgotten" in current usage being a little lower in the economic scale than the "average"; perhaps only the difference between relief and reconstruction.) The radio address emphasizes the individual point of view not by a phrase but more vividly, and more dangerously, by a series of direct questions submitting the progress of the recovery program to the test of "the plain facts of your own individual situation."

Major strategy does not distract the President's attention from the first principles of the rhetorical art. The most conspicuous example of this important faculty in these addresses is common to all three, the careful statement of new projects in terms of "old and tested American ideals." In the radio speech he uses for this purpose the timely analogy of the alteration of the White House offices: "The artistic lines of the White House buildings were the creation of master builders when our Republic was young. The simplicity and the strength of the structure remain in the face of every modern test. But within this magnificent pattern, the necessities of modern government business require constant reorganization and rebuilding." The analogy is as well done as it is well chosen.

Though the three addresses are based on the same fundamental strategy, each is adjusted to its particular situation. The Message is impressed with the dignity of a state paper and the cordiality which Mr. Roosevelt has maintaineed in his attitude toward Congress. The radio speech's personal tone is more obvious—obtrusive, some might fee'—and the conclusion approaches the feeble-forceful style of commonplace exhortation. In the Green Bay speech he observes the occasion with a generous narrative of Wisconsin history. More importantly, he touches what to most of Wisconsin was the real point of the speech, Senator LaFollette's place in the Roosevelt family.

With the emphasis of the well-tried device of "departing from the prepared text," the President names by name "Bob LaFollette and Ryan Duffy," thanking Wisconsin's two senators in the unity of the New Deal program, without notice of LaFollette's present candidacy but without distinction of party label. Wisconsin debated whether this was an "endorsement" of LaFollette. If the parlor experts can improve on Mr. Roosevelt's tactics they may be proud of themselves.

GENERAL HUGH S. JOHNSON: SPEECH AT WATERLOO, IOWA, JULY 12.

When President Roosevelt tries to dispel the confusion of the public and to demonstrate the harmony and coherence of his program, he speaks as the one universally looked upon as the harmonizing and unifying force of the Administration. When General Johnson speaks to the same purpose he is apt to appear as a major disruptive force. Especially before an agricultural audience there would be some burden of ethical proof upon the General to overcome the tendency to see him and the NRA as out of step with agricultural recovery.

The method in this speech of overcoming the ethical handicap and of showing that all administrations work together for good to those who love the New Deal, consists of (1) the instruction "when anybody tells you that NRA and the Blue Eagle have not done for the farmer all that he hoped, you can confidently tell them to go jump in the lake," (2) the assertion that NRA had no such duty to the farmers, that NRA has done more for the farmers than all the billions spent for them by all other departments of government, and that "the big point about the whole recovery program is its element of balance," and (3) the assurance that, with an administrator of the same "breed, background and upbringing," NRA will never be administered to hurt the Middle West.

General Johnson did not make as many speeches on his western tour as were originally announced.

Two incidentals of the speech might be of more interest than the essentials to students of public discussion. One is the introductory reference to the recent "purging" of the Nazis in Germany, which brought diplomatic protests. The other is the tirbute to Senator Borah as "one of our greatest men and certainly one of our greatest orators," who "took the West away from Al Smith and gave it to Herbert Hoover by one single speech," and with Hiram Johnson "went out and busted the League of Nations."

The General is easily the most original stylist of the Administration orators. His literary allusions may not always be caught immediately, but there is usually a paraphrase to help the less erudite or less nimble auditor; for example, "NRA is like the whipping boy at the court of Henry VIII. It is blamed and cussed for everything." His not so literary metaphors have to explain themselves, except as a series of equivalents is offered as interpretation; for example, "There is no such thing as scissors with one blade or two hills without a valley or a pair of pants with only one leg."

One can understand how it was possible for General Johnson's son to parody his father's oratory successfully enough to enrage the General.

MAYOR FIORELLO LAGUARDIA: LABOR DAY ADDRESS, CHICAGO, SEPTEMBER 3.

As a member of Congress Mayor LaGuardia was one of the most effective spokesmen against reaction and privilege and for social and economic progress. As Mayor of New York he has spoken often and probably as well as ever but on local issues and usually to a local audience, though one including several millions. His Labor Day address brought him back to the nation.

Mayors on most occasions and most speakers on Labor Day may be content with ceremonial oratory. This address is deliberative. The argument is rational, coherent, and moderate, and the scope of the argument excuse enough for not carrying it back to axiomatic major premises and demonstrated minors. Beliefs of the audience and general information were reasonably given the burden of ultimate support. The final deductions are specific and timely policies for organized labor.

The style throughout is characterized by short, vigorous, maxim-like declarations, the most conspicuous epigram being, "The hungry children of the unemployed cannot be fed with epigrams."

An editorial in the New York *Times* calls the body of the speech "not only a bit startling but a good deal incoherent and inconclusive." Being startled or not is unobjectionable, but one may suspect that the other adjectives were pormpted more by dislike of Mr. LaGuardia's theses than by the demerits of his argument. V. E. S.

NEWS AND NOTES

[Please send items of interest for this department directly to Miss Lousene Rousseau, 49 East 33d Street, New York City.]

In accordance with Article I, Section 1, of the By-laws of the Constitution of THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH as amended by the 1933 Convention at New York, the following additional nominations have been made for the annual election to be held at the 1934 Convention at New Orleans:

President: Arleigh B. Williamson, New York University

First Vice-President: C. M. Wise, Louisiana State University

Second Vice-President: P. H. Scott, Wayne University

Members of the Council: H. P. Constans, University of Florida; R. K. Immel, University of Southern California; J. H. Muyskens, University of Michigan; G. R. R. Pflaum, Kansas State Teachers College.

(Signed)

Carlisle G. Bigger	Leroy Lewis	Osceola Pooler
Carl G. Brandt	E. A. McFaul	Hazel Shamleffer
E. C. Buehler	Anne McGurk	H. H. Shohara
Robert E. Card	F. B. McKay	Marjorie G. Smith
Harold A. Dressel	Marion L. Miller	Clara B. Stoddard
Agnes G. Fry	Cyretta Morford	Gertrude Stauffer
Julia E. Gettemy	Vera Oehmke	Harold Westlake
Hildred A. Gross	Jos. P. Phillips	Geraldine E. Wieman
Bernard J. Knittel	Elizabeth Pike	Geo. D. Wilner

* * *

FORENSIC LUNCHEON—Delta Sigma Rho, Pi Kappa Delta, Tau Kappa Alpha, and Phi Rho Pi will unite at New Orleans to hold a forensic luncheon meeting on Friday, December 28. All members of the society, in attendance at the convention or residing in and near New Orleans, may make reservations for the luncheon at the registration desk. All of the national presidents, or their representatives, will be on hand to meet society members. Plan now to attend the forensic luncheon.

* * *

The Magic of Speech broadcasts, under the direction of Miss Vida R. Sutton, are again being sent out by the National Broadcasting Company on Friday afternoons, from 2–2:30 E.S.T., in co-operation with the Radio Council for American Speech. The September programs were concerned with Radio and Education, and those for October with America's Speech Problem. The

general subjects for the remainder of the year are as follows: November, Radio Writing and Speaking; December, Studies in Pronunciation and Usage; January, What and How to Read; February, Vocabulary Building; March, Old Arts Revived; April, Public Speaking; May, Grammar Today and Yesterday; June, Speech and Personality. Reading lists, manuals, and leaflets are sent at nominal cost to those who wish to follow the series, and further information can be secured from Miss Sutton, NBC, Radio City, New York.

* * *

A number of papers to be read at the 24th annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, which will be held at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington on November 29 and 30 and December 1, are of interest to teachers of speech. At the General Session on Friday, Prof. J. M. O'Neill, of the University of Michigan, will speak on "The Relation of Speech to English: Suggestions for Extended Co-operation." Dr. Cabell Greet, of Columbia University, will be chairman of the conference on Current Language Problems in the United States, at which the following papers will be read: "The Psychology of Learning with Reference to the Acquisition of Language," Dr. Kurt Koffka, Smith College; "The Oral English Section of the New York State Syllabus," Helene Willey Hartley, Syracuse University; and "The High School Teacher and the Standard of Usage," by Albert H. Marckwardt, of the University of Michigan. The conference on Speech and Oral English will be held the first afternoon, with Professor O'Neill in charge. The program will be as follows: "The Place of English in the Preparation of Teachers of Speech," Everett Lee Hunt, Swarthmore College; "The Place of Speech in the Preparation of Teachers of English," Frank M. Rarig, University of Minnesota; and "Shall Speech Be Taught Directly or Indirectly?" Gladys Borchers, University of Wisconsin.

* * *

The officers of the Eastern Public Speaking Conference, elected at the Atlantic City meeting in April, are as follows: President, W. M. Parrish, University of Pittsburgh; Vice-President, Mary T. McGrath, James Madison High School, Brooklyn; Secretary-Treasurer, Charles A. Fritz, New York University; Executive Committee Members: Ruth H. Thomas, Passaic High School; Herbert A. Wichelns, Cornell University; A. B. Williamson, New York University.

* * *

The fifth annual convention of the Southern Association of Teachers of Speech was held at Birmingham, Alabama, April 19–21. The three days preceding were used for student contests in oratory, after-dinner and extempore speaking, and debate. At the same time a poetry-speaking festival was held for both men and women. The convention program is summarized as follows:

Thursday, April 19, Meeting of the Executive Council

The meeting was opened by the president, H. P. Constans, University of Florida. Reports were made by the second and fourth vice-presidents, Miss Vera Alice Paul and Miss Pearl Buchanan. The following questions were raised by these reports: (1) Could a definite program be evolved for the association news-letter? (2) Through which office should the letter be distributed? (3) Are the dues paid by members 'sustaining dues' only? (4)

Should the southern region be divided into eastern and western parts? (5) Should dues be accepted from West Virginia, Oklahoma, and Texas, which states border on other regional associations? (6) Should additional contests be held in the pre-convention days? (7) Should the Southern Association hold a convention in the coming year? The motion was passed that the Southern Association meet with the National Convention in New Orleans and that a spring date for the tournament be set by a committee.

The evening was kept free in order that the delegates might attend the performance of *The Barrets of Wimpole Street* by Katherine Cornell.

Friday, April 20, General Session

President Constans opened the meeting by introducing Mr. C. B. Glenn, Superintendent of the City School, who gave an address of welcome to the delegates. The response for the association was given by Mr. E. H. Paget, North Carolina State College. The enthusiastic message from the National President was read and followed by the report of the Secretary-Treasurer. Mr. Constans then spoke to the convention urging the continued growth and influence of the association particularly in the coming year because of the additional incentive given to speech work in the south by the meeting of the National Convention in New Orleans. An impromptu play was demonstrated by Mr. E. H. Paget, North Carolina State College.

Sectional meetings were held throughout the rest of the day. In the morning Mr. M. F. Evans, Birmingham-Southern College, addressed the college teachers on the problems of the Fundamental Course. The private school teachers were given papers by Mrs. H. H. Blanton, Birmingham, Miss Laura Plonk, Asheville, North Carolina, and Miss Mamie Jones, Thomasville, Georgia. In the afternoon the sectional meetings were divided into Debate and Public Speaking in one group, Diction and Speech Correction in another, Research and Bibliography in a third, and Secondary Schools in a fourth group. Mr. A. B. Hoskins, Asheville Teachers College, discussed "The Handling of the Debate Squad," and Mr. A. A. Hopkins presented a paper, "The Content and Procedure for an Advanced Public Speaking Course. Miss Frances Gooch, Agnes Scott College, and Dr. Gray of Louisiana State University, addressed the third group; while Miss Lelia M. Smith, Phillips H. S., Birmingham, and Harley Smith, Louisiana State University, spoke to the secondary school teachers.

Executive Council

The motion was made and passed that the president be solely responsible for the forming of the convention program. State associations are to be used as much as possible in improving mailing lists and in securing more members. Tournament fees for the coming year are to be changed: $2.50 for an individual entrant; $5.00 for a blanket fee for any number of entrants; $2.00 for debate; $1.50 for any other contest. The question was raised as to how a regional program could be provided. An effort is to be made to reach elementary teachers through required speech courses in teachers colleges. Another aim is to further academic recognition by State Educational Departments. Thirdly, the association is to urge the extension of speech correction in the city school incidently to open more positions for teachers of speech. Lastly, the association is to further the recognition of high school credits in speech.

Saturday, April 21, Sectional Meetings

Again a division of the college and secondary school teachers was made. Miss Hazel Abbott, Converse College, Mr. I. C. Stover, Stetson University, and Mr. W. H. Trumbauer, Alabama College, addressed their remarks to the general subject of dramatics and interpretation. Extra-curricular Activities were discussed by the secondary school teachers, papers being read by Mr. A. B. Hoskins, Asheville Teachers College, Miss Anne C. Wallace, Wesleyan Conservatory, Miss Rose B. Johnson, Woodlawn H. S., Birmingham, and Mr. A. A. Hopkins, University of Florida.

General Session

At the business meeting a report was made by the third vice-presidency of the extra-curricular activities carried on in 158 colleges in the South. The following officers were elected for the coming year: Mr. C. M. Wise, Louisiana State University, President; T. Earle Johnson, University of Alabama, First Vice-President; Miss Helen Osband, Alabama College, Second Vice-President; Mr. A. B. Hoskins, Asheville Teachers College, Third Vice-President; Miss Marguerite Wills, Southern College, Fourth Vice-President; Miss Louise Blymyer, Berea College, Secretary-Treasurer. An advisory committee was elected to assist the president in promoting interest for the 1934 National Convention. Mr. Constans was chairman of the committee, and Miss Frances Gooch, Agnes Scott College, Mr. Earl Bryan, Texas State College for Women, Miss Louise Thomas, Mississippi State College for Women, were to serve as members. Mr. H. P. Constans was also elected to be regional representative on the national regional committee. A resolution was passed that in the next election of officers there would be some representation from the secondary schools.

The meeting adjourned to the Association Luncheon where the members of the convention were addressed by Mr. John McGee, Director of the Little Theatre of Birmingham, who urged the members to co-operate with the Little Theatre movement in the discovery of usable manuscripts and the maintaining of a high level of amateur performances.

After a short joint meeting of the Executive Councils the convention adjourned.

* * *

The officers of the Georgia Association of Teachers of Speech for 1934–1935 are as follows: President, Mrs. Allie Hayes Richardson, Shorter College; Secretary-Treasurer, Carolyn Vance, University of Georgia; 1st Vice-President, Frances K. Gooch, Agnes Scott College; 2nd Vice-President, Ruth Draper, Washington Seminary; and 3rd Vice-President, Mrs. William W. Davison, of Atlanta.

* * *

The Fourth Annual State Speech Conference of the Oregon Speech Association was held at Salem on the fourteenth of April, with more than 125 teachers of speech in attendance. The outstanding accomplishment of the conference was the final agreement upon the content of the proposed high school basic course in speech, which has been the subject of investigation for several years. The present chairman of the committee, Paul Menegat, of the Scappoose High School, was authorized to prepare the final draft of the course.

Another step taken by the Association was the appointment of a committee to investigate thoroughly the high school debating situation and to make recommendations for its improvement. Dorsey E. Dent, of the Gresham High School, is chairman of the committee. The new officers elected were as follows: President, John L. Casteel, University of Oregon; Vice-President, John Purcell, Jefferson High School, Portland; Secretary-Treasurer, Miss Elma B. Gormans, Portland public schools.

Forensics

In the June "News and Notes" it was noted that eighty-four Delta Sigma Rho alumni were listed in the *Leaders in Education*, a companion volume to *American Men of Science*. Since then President H. L. Ewbank has made a more careful study of the men listed, with the result that sixty-four names were added to the list, making a total of 148 members of Delta Sigma Rho listed in *Leaders in Education*. Following up this study, Dr. Ewbank made a study of *Who's Who in America*, in which he discovered that 308 alumni of Delta Sigma Rho were listed—an impressive record for an organization as relatively new as this honorary forensic organization.

Under the auspices of the Wisconsin High School Forensic Association and the Future Farmers of America, a series of state contests in forensic activities was held at the University early in May. The Forensic Association held its annual contests in oratory, extemporaneous reading and speaking, and declamation, and the Future Farmers of America its oratorical contest, in the Assembly Chamber of the State Capitol, the latter being broadcast over stations WHA and WLBL. The state dramatic contest of the Association was held this year considerably earlier and at one of the competing towns instead of in Madison. Following the usual custom, a breakfast conference was held at the Wisconsin Memorial Union, with all contestants the guests of the Association.

The Michigan High School Forensic Association held its seventeenth annual state championship debate at the University of Michigan the last Friday in April, with an attendance so large that the debate was held in the Hill Auditorium. Dr. Paul F. Voelker, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, presided, and the judges were H. L. Ewbank, of the University of Wisconsin, president of the National Association of Teachers of Speech, and Professors O'Neill and Densmore of the University of Michigan. The proposition for debate was "Resolved: That all radio broadcasting in the United States should be conducted in stations owned and controlled by the Federal Government." Following the usual custom, the Detroit *Free Press* presented gold watches to the six debaters participating in the contest, pins to the debaters who took part in any of the elimination debates, and wall plaques to each of the schools entering the elimination series. The University of Michigan Extension Division presented bronze cups to the two teams competing in the finals, according to custom. J. H. McBurney, of the University of Michigan staff in speech, is manager of the Michigan High School Forensic Association.

Colleges and universities in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia participated in the first annual debate conference held under the auspices of the University of Pittsburgh chapter of Delta Sigma Rho. A number of events were scheduled for the conference, which was held late in April. There were debates on the proposition, "Resolved: That the essential features of the NIRA

should be made permanent"; public discussions on the subject, "What should be the attitude of the college student toward peace and war?"; after-dinner speaking, and round-table discussions for college coaches, varsity debaters, debate managers, and high school coaches.

The Bates college debaters enjoyed an unusual debate trip last year. Invited by the Canadian Federation of University Students to send a team to Canada as guests of the Canadian Universities, two Bates debaters travelled about 10,000 miles in six weeks, debating Dalhousie University, Acadia University, Mount Allison University, Bishop's University, Ontario Agricultural College, the Young Men's Conservation Club and Columbus Debating Club of Calgary, Alberta, the University of Alberta, the University of British Columbia, the Service Clubs Council of Victoria, the University of Saskatchewan, the Regina Y.M.C.A., and the University of Manitoba.

This year's officers of Pi Kappa Delta, honorary forensic fraternity, are the following: President, George McCarty, South Dakota State College; First Vice-President, S. R. Toussaint, Monmouth College; Secretary-Treasurer, G. W. Finley, State Teachers College of Greeley, Colorado; Historian, H. Dana Hopkins, Heidelberg College.

The Western Conference Debating League held a spring tournament at Northwestern University in which three rounds of debates were held, each member school debating with every other member except those which had been met in the fall series. The proposition was, "Resolved: That Japan should accept the recommendations of the Lytton Commission as a basis for future policy in the Far East." It is interesting to note that the affirmative won thirteen of the debates and the negative fourteen.

The Wabash College Speakers Bureau supplied 105 calls for speakers during the past year. The most popular subjects were "The Real Heroes of This Depression," "The Inside of the Boxing Ring," given by a professional prizefighter student, and "A Ranger in Yellowstone," given by a student who is a forest ranger in summer.

An indication of the great variety in debating activities in colleges and universities is given by the following figures: Washington State College last year had 128 debates, two of which were broadcast over KWSC, and 28 debaters participated; Ohio Wesleyan University had 42 debates, 19 for varsity men, 17 for varsity women, two each for men and women of the Freshman class, with 42 debaters participating. All of the debates were non-decision, and ten were Oregon-style debates. Carleton College had 21 debates, 16 for men and five for women, with all home debates non-decision. Wisconsin had nine debates for men and two for women, and 144 students participated in the local discussion contest. At North Dakota, twelve men took part in 56 debates; Marquette University had 64 debates, the University of Colorado 21 debates, Beloit College 26, and Elmira College seven.

Dramatics

One of the outstanding dramatic performances of the summer was the production of *Othello*, under the direction of Robert Edmond Jones and with Walter Huston in the title role, at the Third Annual Play Festival at Central City Opera House in Colorado. The festival lasted from July 21 to August 4.

Earl E. Fleischman, for many years in charge of dramatics at the Univer-

sity of Michigan, is now in charge of the Dramatic Art Department at Rollins College, in Florida, which has organized a Student Company to present plays of distinction in the college's theatre, the Annie Russell Theatre. During the past year the company presented, among others, *Mary the Third*, by Rachel Crothers, *Death Takes a Holiday*, adapted by Walter Ferris from the Italian play by Alberto Casella, *Beggar on Horseback*, by Kaufman and Connelly, Barrie's *Dear Brutus*, and Noel Coward's *Hay Fever*. The Annie Russell Theatre was opened in 1932, the gift of Mrs. Edward Bok in honor of her friend, the distinguished actress, Miss Annie Russell. Each year a professional artists series in music, the dance, and drama is presented in the theatre, and Miss Russell maintains her own company, composed of faculty, townspeople, and advanced students, and acts as Artistic Director of the plays presented by the students.

The presentation of Booth Tarkington's *Seventeen* by the Pontiac High School, Michigan, last April, probably has the record for number of performances of a high school play. It played to packed houses six evenings and one afternoon, and the admission charge was seventeen cents. The director, W. N. Viola, has recently completed the organization of a "Theatre Arts Guild," which has for its purpose not only the presentation of worth while plays, but also the support of good plays.

As a feature of the summer session at the New Mexico Normal University, a Round Table on Southwestern Literature is held, to which famous writers of New Mexico are invited. As a part of this conference the past summer a Little Theatre Conference was held the first afternoon, at which several papers were read. Lester Raines, of the Normal University, discussed the contemporary European stage, and Katheryn Kennedy O'Connor, of the Albuquerque Little Theatre, discussed the contemporary New York stage; Marjorie Wilson, of the Sante Fe Players, discussed the staging of children's plays, and Morris Vorenberg, of the Carlsbad Little Theatre, discussed the Little Theatre Workshop. A puppetry demonstration was staged by Marjorie Mantor of the Normal University. As a climax to the conference, the Koshares, Delightmakers, dramatic organization of the Normal University, presented the play *Lupita*, written by Elizabeth Willis DeHuff of Santa Fe, and concerned with New Mexico in the days before the Civil War. Other performances of the Koshares during the past season have included Molnar's *The Swan*, and *Bacon to the Wolves*, by Isabel Campbell, both directed by Lester Raines, and *The Mollusc*, by H. H. Davies, directed by Dorothy Dillard.

The spring dramatic production of Wabash College was *The Last Mile*, which was directed by Myron G. Phillips.

Under the direction of Walter H. Trumbauer, Alabama College recently staged the old Beaumont and Fletcher comedy, *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. The Peter Pan Club of the same institution presented *The Princess and the Swineherd*, by Gwendolen Seiler, with Willilee Reaves Trumbauer in charge.

Commencement plays at the Leland Powers School of the Theatre were Noel Coward's *The Young Idea*, directed by Arthur Holman, and *Disraeli*, directed by Iva Roberts.

Personals

Lee Emerson Bassett, of Stanford University, former president of the National Association of Teachers of Speech, is spending the present year in residence at the University of Hawaii. Edward Z. Rowell is taking his place at Stanford, where he is giving two new courses, one an upper division course on Leadership, Its Conditions and Methods, and the other a graduate course on Problems in Speech Theory.

W. Norwood Brigance of Wabash College spent July with his family in Reno, Nevada. He reports, however, that his intentions were not matrimonial. Professor Brigance was recently elected Vice-President of Tau Kappa Alpha, national honorary forensic fraternity.

J. M. O'Neill, of the University of Michigan, spent the summer with his family at Wakefield, Rhode Island.

Miss Laura Shaw and Miss Dorothy Eccles, of the Western State Teachers College of Kalamazoo, Michigan, spent the summer driving through New England and visiting the summer theatres from Maine to Connecticut.

W. V. O'Connell, formerly of the State Teachers College at Ada, Oklahoma, is now in charge of speech work at Battle Creek College.

Myron G. Phillips, of Wabash College, spent the summer doing graduate work at the University of Wisconsin.

W. S. Howell, formerly of Dartmouth College and Harvard University, has joined the staff in public speaking at Princton University.

The second candidate to complete requirements for the doctorate with a minor in Speech at the University of Southern California, Paul J. Ritter received his Ph.D. degree at the June, 1934, graduation. The major work was done in the field of Education, the dissertation topic being, "A Study of Speech in Secondary Schools with Particular Emphasis on the Academic and Professional Training of the Public Secondary Teacher of Speech." Charles Fredrick Lindsey was the first to receive the Ph.D. degree with a minor in Speech. Doris Yoakam is now a candidate for the doctor's degree with a major in Speech.

After teaching for seven years in the schools of Evanston and in the School of Speech at Northwestern University, Miss Belle Kennedy has been granted a leave of absence from the University to study in London and on the Continent.

Who's Who
in
Speech Education

★ ★ ★

The National Directory of Teachers of Speech for 1935 will contain the names and addresses of the leading teachers of Speech in the United States and Canada. It will represent, virtually, a "Who's Who" in the field of Speech Education. Obviously, it will be to the distinct advantage of every teacher of Speech to be listed in this new National Directory.

New teachers of Speech who wish to have their names appear in the Directory for 1935, should send in their applications for membership in The National Association of Teachers of Speech immediately. The fee for membership in the National Association and subscription for The Quarterly Journal of Speech is $2.50 a year.

Teachers of Speech who have neglected to renew their membership in the National Association and subscription for the Quarterly Journal are urged to do so as soon as possible.

Current members of the National Association are requested to fill out and return their Directory Listing Cards without delay.

Listings for the National Directory for 1935 must be recorded at the office of the Executive Secretary prior to January 1st.

All orders for copies of the Directory of The National Association of Teachers of Speech for 1935 must be accompanied by stamps, money order, or check for the amount of the order. (PLEASE SEND STAMPS IF THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF YOUR REMITTANCE IS LESS THAN $1.00.)

Price of Directory: 50c Each

Only the names of current members at date of publication will be listed in the 1935 Directory.

Send Membership Applications and Directory Orders to:

G. E. DENSMORE, *Executive Secretary*
The National Association of Teachers of Speech
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan